DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 302 EC 013 108

AUTHOR Black, Talbot; And Others
TITLE Serving Young Handicapped Children in Rural America. Proceedings of the HCEEP Rural Workshop (Nashville, Tennessee, March 12-14, 1980). 1980 Series.
INSTITUTION North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill. Technical Assistance Development System.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO TADS-4
PUB DATE 80
CONTRACT 300-77-0507
NOTE 112p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation; Community Services; Cooperative Programs; Coordination; Cost Effectiveness; *Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; Early Childhood Education; Family Involvement; *Financial Support; Health Services; Personnel; Questionnaires; Recruitment; *Rural Areas; Rural Development; Rural Population; *Special Education; Training Methods; Workshops; *Young Children
IDENTIFIERS *Handicapped Childrens Early Education Program

ABSTRACT

Activities of the 104 participants at the first 3-day Rural Workshop of the Handicapped Childrens Early Education Program (HCEEP) Rural Consortium focused on identifying issues and needs of rural projects serving young handicapped children and their families. A pre-workshop survey identified topics and issues to be addressed and resource speakers, panel presenters, and materials. Keynote speaker Dr. Jerry Fletcher recommended political advocacy as an effective method for focusing attention on the need for early childhood special education in rural areas. Concurrent sessions offered a variety of topics including: successful practices in securing funding; stress on rural service providers; establishing community communication and awareness; securing funding for rural programs; assessing parent needs and planning intervention programs; influencing decision makers; cost-effective delivery strategies; recruiting staff for rural areas; interagency coordination; interagency troubleshooting; transportation problems. Issues generated during the concurrent small group presentations fell into six categories: direct service delivery; interagency coordination; funding and policy decisions; training and staff-related concerns; parent/family involvement; and working in the rural community. Workshop evaluation results indicated purposes were met. Appended are: Rural Workshop Interest Survey, Rural Workshop Agenda, List of Participants, List of Congressional Rural Caucus, HCEEP Rural Resource Directory, and Rural Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire. (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED211302

SERVING YOUNG HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN RURAL AMERICA

Written and Edited by
Talbot Black
David Gilderman
Joyce Jackson
Michael Woodard

RC013108

1980 Series

TADS
Number 4

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Hutinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JAN 1982
ERIC / CRESS
RECEIVED

SERVING YOUNG HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN RURAL AMERICA

Proceedings of the HCEEP Rural Workshop

Written and Edited by
Talbot Black
David Gilderman
Joyce Jackson
Michael Woodard

Maxwell House Hotel
Nashville, Tennessee
March 12-14, 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	*iii*
Introduction	1
HCEEP Rural Workshop Survey Report	7
Keynote Address	17
Special Education: The Broader Context of National Rural Policy ... Dr. Jerry Fletcher	
Synopses of Concurrent Sessions	33
Issues of Concern	63
HCEEP Rural Workshop Evaluation	71
Appendices	81

This book was developed pursuant to contract 300-77-0507 from the U. S. Department of Education. Contractors who undertake such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Department of Education position or policy.

OSE Project Officer, Dr. David Rostetter

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors wish to thank the following individuals for their help in preparing this document:

Vivian Correa, Janet Coscarelli, Judy Davis, Maria Donofrio, Elizabeth Gerlock, Jo Von Vieda, Mary Porter, Vaughn Stagg, and Jackie Sweat for their help in compiling materials used in the session synopses and issues of concern sections.

Pamela Bailey and Pat Trohanis for copy editing the final manuscript.

Mary Watkins and Debbie Creamer for typing the preliminary and final manuscripts.

PREFACE

A MESSAGE FROM THE RURAL CONSORTIUM

The HCEEP Rural Workshop was a milestone in the emergence of the HCEEP Rural Consortium, an active professional group dedicated to the education of young handicapped children living in rural areas and their families. The workshop informed, excited and directed us; responded to the current needs of the consortium; and fueled its further elaboration. A few words about the significance of the workshop for the consortium are in order.

The HCEEP Rural Consortium first emerged during the 1978 HCEEP Projects Conference in Washington, DC. At that time, approximately 20 persons representing rural projects within the HCEEP network joined to form the Rural Consortium. The consortium intended to provide a voice for America's young handicapped children living in rural areas and their families, and to increase educational opportunities for this population. Participating projects also desired to enhance their own effectiveness in providing educational and supportive services to their clients. Thus, they needed to share information about problems they encountered and about effective solutions.

The development of a national Rural Workshop was seen as an important early activity for the consortium. Not only would the workshop promote sharing of expertise and know-how among rural educators, but it might also help to clarify the organization's identity, goals, and structure. If successful, the workshop would also provide a measure of positive external visibility for the consortium.

With these intentions in mind, the leadership of the HCEEP Rural Consortium solicited the assistance of the Office of Special Education (at that time the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped) who in turn placed

responsibility for convening the HCEEP Rural Workshop in the capable hands of WESTAR and TADS.

As expected, the workshop was a highly successful event for the consortium. The organization emerged from the workshop as a more cohesive entity, with its future directions charted. Participants developed important working relationships with one another. Task forces were extended and their missions were crystallized. The sessions offered important information and persons attending them made contacts for future technical assistance. Overall the workshop significantly enhanced the spirit, and directed the energy of the HCEEP Rural Consortium.

As a post-script, readers will be interested in knowing that the consortium activities have moved forward at an accelerating pace since the workshop. A consortium planning group met in June, 1980. There were two important accomplishments. One was the development of a draft of a set of preliminary recommendations for federal policy regarding young handicapped children and their families in rural areas. These recommendations will be circulated among Rural Consortium members for comment, and then submitted to the appropriate federal agencies for consideration.

The second product of the June meeting was a plan for an expanded set of activities for the consortium. These plans include: (1) convening a second Rural Workshop; (2) writing a series of state-of-the-art documents describing effective procedures for providing services in rural areas; (3) preparing a manual on developing support in rural communities for ECSE; (4) identifying and supporting a person to coordinate all consortium efforts and to maintain liaison with outside agencies; and (5) developing an elaborated set of policy recommendations. We are all very encouraged by the accomplishments of the consortium so far and

believe the prospects for supporting these activities during the coming year are very bright indeed.

On behalf of the HCEEP Rural Consortium, I would like to thank the workshop planning committee for their excellent work in putting on the conference. Serving with me were consortium members Louise Phillips, Patricia Hutinger, Corinne Garland, and Steve Threet. Special thanks are due our technical support colleagues -- Joyce Jackson, David Gilderman, and Karen Morris of WESTAR and Tal Black and Mike Woddard of TADS -- for their extensive and very able work on the planning committee and in every other phase of the workshop. A debt of gratitude is owed the presenters and, especially, the participants in the workshop for creating an atmosphere filled with enthusiasm and excellence. Finally, I would like to extend the thanks of the HCEEP Rural Consortium and the children and families they serve throughout rural America to the Office of Special Education. The continuous and generous support given us by OSE transformed the Rural Workshop from a dream into a future.

Harris Gabel, Chairman
HCEEP Rural Consortium
July 16, 1980

INTRODUCTION

On March 12-14, 1980, the first rural workshop for the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP) was held in Nashville, Tennessee. The HCEEP Rural Workshop was jointly planned and conducted by TADS (Technical Assistance Development System) and WESTAR (Western States Technical Assistance Resource) under the sponsorship of the Office of Special Education and in cooperation with the recently formed HCEEP Rural Consortium.

It was an important event in the history of HCEEP because it marked the first time the resources of the HCEEP network were focused specifically on serving young handicapped children and their families in rural America. Over one hundred rural educators and other service providers participated. They represented rural HCEEP demonstration, outreach, and state implementation grant projects from thirty-two states and territories. Other individuals serving rural children and families, but not a part of the HCEEP network, also participated.

How the Workshop was Developed

The idea for the HCEEP Rural Workshop was conceived when the HCEEP Rural Consortium was formed at the November 1978, HCEEP Project's Conference in Washington, DC. The new consortium requested that TADS and WESTAR consider supporting a workshop for rural projects. The request was proposed to BEH and approved as a part of the joint workscope of both technical assistance agencies. TADS and WESTAR created a committee to be responsible for planning the workshop. Membership included the following individuals: Harris Gable, Louise Phillips, Patricia Hutinger, Corrine Garland, and Steve Threet of the

Rural Consortium; Joyce Jackson, David Gilderman, and Karen Morris of WESTAR; and Tal Black and Mike Woodard of TADS.

In June, 1979, the planning committee met for the first time. They identified three "first order" questions upon which all subsequent planning would depend: (1) Which projects consider themselves as rural? (2) What are the most important problems and issues they face? and (3) How many are interested in attending a rural workshop? A survey was designed to answer these questions and was sent to all HCEEP projects in September, 1979, along with an announcement of the workshop date and location. (See Appendix A) The survey confirmed a strong interest among the projects in the workshop and identified the topics and issues that needed to be addressed. It also identified resources among the projects that could address the workshop agenda.

A tentative workshop agenda, based on the results of the survey, was developed at a second meeting of the planning committee in November, 1979. The search for resources (speakers, panel presenters, materials) was shared by planning committee members. Local arrangements were facilitated by the HCEEP projects located in Nashville and Columbia, Tennessee. In January, 1980, a follow-up survey to all who expressed an interest in the workshop provided additional information that led to the organization of the final agenda. (See Appendix B)

General Purposes

The workshop was conceived and planned to accomplish the following:

- To identify the issues and needs of rural projects serving young handicapped children and their families
- To facilitate communication and cooperation among rural HCEEP projects
- To exchange information and ideas on successful practices

° To identify new developments and perspectives from other fields serving rural areas (agriculture, business, health, social services, and the church).

The workshop was also designed to support and strengthen the work of the HCEEP Rural Consortium and to demonstrate the viability of such cooperative activities. These general purposes were formulated by the rural workshop planning committee.

Overview of the Workshop

The three-day workshop agenda provided a variety of learning and sharing opportunities, including speakers with national perspectives, workshop sessions on a wide range of topics, and task force meetings. Over one hundred individuals participated in these activities. (See Appendix C)

National Speakers. Dr. Jerry Fletcher, keynote speaker, presented some of the broad contextual problems and issues faced by rural educators in general. As a former senior policy analyst for the Office of Education, Fletcher helped organize and conduct the first National Seminar on Rural Education in May, 1979. He strongly recommended political advocacy as an effective method for focusing attention on the need for early childhood special education in rural areas.

United States' Representative Wes Watkins from Oklahoma, the closing speaker, echoed Dr. Fletcher's call for political action. Watkins, who is chairperson of the Congressional Rural Caucus, shared his perspectives on the plight of education in rural America. He pointed out that rural education programs currently receive a disproportionately small share of federal program funds, basically because their needs are neither known nor understood. He urged workshop participants to become politically active by writing their congresspersons and making their needs known. Members of the Congressional Rural Caucus are listed in Appendix D.

Topical Sessions. A dozen topics of high interest to rural HCEEP projects were addressed at the workshop through panel presentations, small group discussions, and reviews of materials. The topics were:

- Securing funding for rural programs
- Parent involvement
- Influencing decision-makers
- Interagency coordination
- Recruiting staff for rural areas
- Cost effective delivery strategies
- Rural child find
- Establishing community communication and awareness
- Stress on rural service providers
- Transportation problems
- What other fields have learned about serving rural clients

These topics were identified through the survey of rural HCEEP projects conducted by TADS. The results of that survey are included in the next section of this proceedings document.

The workshop agenda included five one and a half-hour sessions with four topics offered concurrently during each session. High interest topics were offered more than once.

Task Force Meetings

The HCEEP Rural Consortium, chaired by Harris Gabel from Nashville, Tennessee, met for two half-days to review and plan its ongoing activities. Two task forces formed prior to the workshop further refined their plans. The State of the Art Task Force, chaired by Patricia Hutinger from Macomb, Illinois, developed plans for gathering and sharing information on successful practices among rural projects. Eight State of the Art papers are now under

development on topics such as cost effectiveness, transportation, stress on service-providers, interagency coordination, parent involvement, obtaining funding, and effective delivery strategies for rural communities. A paper summarizing the results of a survey conducted by the task force is also being written. Some of these papers are expected to be ready for distribution by the time of the HCEEP Projects Conference in December, 1980. Contributors to these and future State of the Art papers are still being sought. Anyone interested in contributing should contact Dr. Patricia Hutinger at Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois.

The Rural Action Task Force, chaired by Louise Phillips of Magnolia, Arkansas, began plans for a manual on ways to convince rural communities to support and fund services for young handicapped children. Approximately 20 workshop participants generated an outline of the information to be included in this document. Five individuals volunteered to write the major sections. The "Community" chapter will discuss the assessment of the needs of the rural community and the planning process which must occur prior to attempts to create community support. Individuals, groups, and organizations who are likely to become advocates for early childhood special education will be outlined in the "Targets" chapter. People and media tools that can be used to create support will be discussed in the "Tools" section. The last chapter, "Strategies", will include various techniques (and concomitant caveats) which can be used to develop awareness and support for rural special education programs.

The Task Force writing committee met in Memphis in June to review the first draft of each chapter and is currently in the process of revising and editing the document. It is expected that the manual will be ready for distribution at the 1980 HCEEP Projects Conference.

A third task force, headed by Harris Gabel, was formed to explore further the long-range goals and future activities of the Rural Consortium.

In Closing

Two challenges for rural projects grew out of the HCEEP Rural Workshop. First, rural projects must reach out even further to each other to share what they have learned more completely, more effectively, and more frequently. Second, rural projects must communicate their needs and those of the families they serve more effectively in the political arenas where funding and policy decisions are made. Both challenges provide a sense of direction for future HCEEP rural projects' initiatives.

HCEEP RURAL WORKSHOP SURVEY REPORT

When the HCEEP Rural Workshop planning committee met for the first time, many questions were generated that needed to be answered before the detailed planning of the workshop could begin. Those questions included:

- Who are the rural projects in HCEEP?
- Who is interested in a workshop for rural projects?
- What topics should the workshop address?
- What are the major problems/issues faced by rural projects and the families they serve?
- What are the strengths of the rural setting?
- What are some of the resources that could be used in the rural workshop?

To answer these questions, the committee decided to survey the entire HCEEP Network at the same time the Rural Workshop was formally announced. A questionnaire (see Appendix A) was developed and sent to all HCEEP projects, including demonstration projects, outreach projects, state implementation grants (SIG), and some projects no longer funded under HCEEP. Two hundred twenty-seven surveys were sent out; one hundred and fifty were returned for a 66% return rate. The results are reported below.

Part I

Question #1 - Do you consider your project a rural project? Why?

Sixty-four projects said yes and 75 projects said no. However, of the 75 negatives, 24 projects qualified their responses with a "no, but . . .," thus acknowledging some connection with rural areas. The responses to the open-ended question "why?" indicated that rural status was generally judged by either geography (a large area), population density, or both.

Question #2 - Do you now or do you intend to work with projects, agencies, or families in rural areas?

One-hundred and four projects said yes and 35 projects said no. This response, together with the response to question #1, is a strong indication that rural projects make up a very large part of the HCEEP Network. Even if all the projects who failed to return the survey were not rural, practically 50% of the HCEEP Network would be involved in rural areas. The fact is, many of those who did not respond to the survey are rural-based by virtue of their project's location.

Question #3 - Do you and/or other members of your staff plan to attend the rural workshop? If yes, how many?

Thirty-seven projects said yes, and another 47 said maybe, with a total of 144 people expressing interest. Sixty-six projects said no, but most of them were not rural.

Part II

This part of the survey (and also Part III) was to be completed only by those expressing an interest in attending the workshop. Sixty-one projects responded to all or some of the questions in Parts II and III of the survey.

Twenty-five topics were listed in Part II. Respondents were asked to rate their interest in each topic using a five point scale, with five indicating high interest. Below is a rank-order listing of the topics showing the average rating of each topic.

Stress on service providers	4.13
Recruiting support services staff	4.07
Securing funds for rural programs	4.05
Reaching geographically isolated clients	4.03
Rural child find	4.00

Cost-effective delivery strategies	3.93
Influencing decision-makers	3.93
Interagency cooperation	3.92
Getting parent involvement	3.92
Recruiting staff for rural areas	3.87
Transportation problems	3.74
What other fields have learned	3.72
Establishing community communication and awareness	3.59
Obtaining diagnostic workups	3.48
Transition from project to public school/agencies	3.41
Establishing rapport/trust with rural clients	3.38
Working in rural cultures	3.36
Working with rural politics	3.35
Serving minorities and cultural groups	3.33
Working with the extended family	3.30
Training personnel to work in rural areas	3.28
Working with public schools	3.23
Getting your rural experience into print	3.21
Easing home-based to center-based transitions	3.00
Using university resources	2.66

There was moderate to high interest expressed in most topics. One exception was "using university resources" which fell below 3.00.

The high interest topics (those above 3.5) became the topics around which the rural workshop agenda was developed, combining topics when approriate. It is significant to note that there was very little difference in interest ratings among the demonstration, outreach and SIG projects.

Part III

Question #1 - Can you list other topics in addition to those listed in Part II above?

Of fifty-six projects responding, 40 projects (71%) had no additions to make. There was no recurrent topic among those who did suggest other topics. Therefore, it was felt that the topics selected were the most relevant for the workshop.

Question #2 - What do you think are the three most critical issues faced by rural service providers?

Fifty-four projects responded to this more open-ended question. Virtually all of the responses could be categorized under the topics in Part II. Three issues predominated: transportation (33 responses); recruiting staff for rural areas (33 responses); and securing funding for rural programs (18 responses).

Question #3 - What do you think are the three most critical issues faced by families of handicapped children in rural areas?

The same fifty-four projects responded, identifying five key issues: transporting children to services (29 responses); getting appropriate services (25 responses); knowing about available services (14 responses); paying for services (13 responses); and isolation from services and from other parents (11 responses).

Other issues identified were:

- Insufficient education to deal with child's handicap and need for services.
- Insufficient awareness of child's problems
- Insensitivity of others to child's handicap and family's difficult situation
- Access to medical and health services

- Dealing with a variety of agencies
- Accepting the child's handicap
- Community and service-provider awareness of family's needs
- Building family support systems
- Influencing decision-makers
- Obtaining diagnostic workups
- Being aware of educational rights
- Developing skills in working with service-providers
- Disruption of services
- Continuation of services from project to public schools
- Communication between parents
- Working with public schools
- Obtaining quality services
- Language barriers
- Maintaining family integrity
- Communicating with professionals

Question #4 - What are some unique strengths of rural communities in serving young handicapped children and their families?

Responses to this question were wide ranging. No single item emerged as dominant. However, the responses taken together provide a descriptive view of some of the positive attributes of rural settings. Three general themes ran through the responses: family closeness, community support, and cultural values.

Among family related strengths, the availability of an extended family was mentioned most often. Other strengths were: family unit and close relationships, acceptance of the handicap and commitment to the child, reluctance to institutionalize, openness to trying various programs, a home

environment conducive to learning, and willingness to integrate the child's program into everyday activities.

Closeness and togetherness was also mentioned frequently as a community strengths, especially in reference to social networks and "informal bureaucracies." Survey respondents seemed to feel that rural communities are accepting of handicapped children and have a sense of responsibility for them. Other community strengths mentioned were: good communication and coordination of services, less bureaucratic red tape, the church as a resource, the impact of citizens groups as advocates and volunteers, the mixing of age groups, and child find.

A few strengths related to rural culture and values were given. Survey respondents referred to a rural spirit characterized by autonomy, independence, pride, and cooperation. Respondents seemed to feel that education and the school are valued in rural communities. Religious faith and the "good neighbor" ethic were also mentioned as strengths.

Question #5 - Which topic under Part II do you consider to be strengths in your project?

Project responses to this question showed that for most of the 25 topics there were at least a few projects who considered each topic an area of strength. The exceptions were: "what other fields have learned" and "getting your rural experience into print."

The topics cited as strengths most often were interagency coordination, getting parent involvement, and establishing rapport/trust with rural clients. Below is a list of the topics showing how many projects indicated each topic as a strength area:

° Interagency cooperation	24
° Getting parent involvement	21
° Establishing rapport/trust with rural clients	18
° Training personnel to work in rural areas	14
° Working with public schools	13
° Establishing community communication and awareness	13
° Reaching geographically isolated clients	10
° Working with the extended family	9
° Obtaining diagnostic workups	9
° Cost-effective delivery strategies	8
° Securing funding for rural programs	6
° Transition from project to public schools/agencies	6
° Using university resources	6
° Recruiting support services staff	5
° Easing home-based, center-based transitions	5
° Recruiting staff for rural areas	4
° Influencing decision-makers	4
° Stress on service providers	4
° Transportation problems	3
° Rural child find	3
° Serving rural minorities and culture groups	3
° Working in rural cultures	2
° Working in rural politics	1
° Getting your rural experience into print	0
° What other fields have learned	0

Question #6 - Would you be willing to contribute to the workshop in one of your strength areas?

The response to this question was quite encouraging. Many projects expressed a willingness to contribute in one or more topic areas. The topics most often mentioned were interagency cooperation and getting parent involvement. Because of the strong, response, the workshop planning committee was able to cover most of the topics at the workshop using HCEEP projects as resources.

Question #7 - Can you recommend any other resources that might be useful in planning and conducting the workshop?

Twelve projects offered suggestions for other resources which helped the planning committee locate presenters for the workshop.

Summary and Observations

The survey showed that serving families in rural communities is a major part of the HCEEP Network. It identified the areas of greatest interest and concern to rural projects and demonstrated that HCEEP rural projects are a valuable resource for information on serving rural clients. The survey also suggested that rural HCEEP projects are somewhat isolated, and in need of increased opportunities to share their experiences and learning with others.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

SPECIAL EDUCATION: THE BROADER CONTEXT OF NATIONAL RURAL POLICY

DR. JERRY FLETCHER

Editor's Note: Dr. Fletcher's address is presented here as delivered at the workshop.

SPECIAL EDUCATION: THE BROADER CONTEXT OF
NATIONAL RURAL POLICY

Dr. Jerry L. Fletcher
Vice-President
Manifest Learning Systems
Post Office Box 866
Tiburon, CA 94920

Presented to:
HCEEP Rural Workshop
Maxwell House Hotel
Nashville, Tennessee
March 12-14, 1980

In this talk today I will be presenting a broad picture of rural education within which your own experiences can be placed. I will not attempt to deal in detail with special education in rural areas, as that is your expertise, though I will attempt to relate some of the problems and opportunities you have to the broader context.

The points I want to make today fall into six categories:

1. Your Problems Are Not Unique.

The problems you face in delivering special education services to rural areas are, for the most part, common to rural education in general. Put positively, you have a lot of allies out there if you build bridges to them.

2. Washington Decision-Makers Can Be Influenced.

It is possible to influence Washington decision-makers, and I will present as a case study the National Seminar in Rural Education -- which I chaired last May in Washington, DC -- to illustrate how to do it.

3. Important Findings About Rural America.

What happened when we put on the National Seminar on Rural Education was that we learned a whole lot about rural America, and I want to share what we learned.

4. The Recommendations of the National Seminar on Rural Education.

5. The Influence of the Seminar.

We were able to influence several events which happened subsequent to the seminar, and I would like to describe the nature of that influence.

6. Remaining Problems and Targets of Influence.

Many problems still exist, and I would like to outline some of the things that we could do together in working on them. Now, let me take each category in turn.

Your Problems Are Not Unique

In general, the problem with small and isolated schools is that they are small and isolated. This may sound like a truism, but it is amazing how the obvious is often overlooked. When there is a sparse density of population, the cost per unit of delivering anything goes up. Consequently, the kind of heterogeneity you find in special education classes: mixed ages, mixed handicaps, mixed learning difficulties is common to many rural schools. Often there are two or three grade levels together, with wide varieties of special needs. What rural schools need, we are coming to believe, is the equivalent of the general practitioner in medicine. We need to train teachers for rural schools as general practitioners. There is presently no such certification. In a parallel way, your experience of practicing in isolation from other professionals, with salaries lower than are common in the profession is also shared throughout education in rural areas. Finally, the extra burden you feel from the requirements of federal legislation, such as P.L. 94-142 is also felt throughout rural areas in response to federal mandates.

It is difficult to do anything about this because the constituency of rural America is scattered and very diverse. Consequently, this set of problems tends to exist almost unnoticed. If I do nothing else, I want to alert you that there are a lot of other people out there who share the problems you are facing.

Washington Decision-Makers Can Be Influenced

When I got to Washington, I had just finished four years with the Rural Education Program of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, Oregon. When I got to Washington, I seemed to be the only person in the bureaucracy who cared at all about rural education. I did not have it as a part of my official responsibilities. After some time and effort, I did find a few others in the Department of Agriculture; and a few more in the National Institute of Education, but rural advocates were anything but visible.

When I got to Washington, I was also told a few things which proved to be very helpful. First, Washington works a lot like people said it did in the political science course that one takes as a freshman in college. Namely, congressmen provide the things that the voters want them to provide. If you have a constituency that can deliver a lot of votes, congressmen will listen. If you do not have any votes to deliver, it is occasionally true that an idea is good enough that some congressman will listen to it. Even then, though, if the idea does not develop a constituency, it ultimately tends not to get very far.

Second, the federal government works on a minimum of a three-year time cycle. That is, in Washington right now they are planning for 1983. One has to have that kind of time frame. As someone said in a session this morning, if one thinks back to where special education was in 1971 or 1972, it has come an incredible distance, but those of us who are working in it now tend to forget all that. There used to be no early childhood programs, no P.L. 94-142. Over five or six years in Washington, programs change a great deal. But day-to-day or year-to-year it does not feel that way. So think

in a three- to five-year time frame. One can get a lot to happen in five years if one starts now. The key idea is--be persistent.

Third, if one wants to get anything new to happen, there has to be a solid research base to support it. There are lots of laws already on the books that research says are worthless, but they will continue. Congress almost never terminates a program. Data are not necessary to continue a program, but to get a new one, data are critical. To get any new legislation, someone must put together a solid research base for it. This is particularly true for rural education, because, for the most part, the application of legislation to rural historically has been very negative, and yet this has not upset people. We have tried to develop a very solid set of data to show that, and then explain how to change it.

With this as background, let me describe our National Seminar experience. About a year and a half ago, a bunch of us began to meet informally. We never had a formal structure. We called ourselves OCRE (Organizations Concerned about Rural Education). We began to meet just to talk about rural issues. After people continued to come for four or five months, we began to ask if there were anything we might do. The idea of holding a conference focused on federal policy toward rural education occurred to us.

We managed to convince one person, Dr. Thomas K. Minter, then the Deputy Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education in the Office of Education, to give us some money for such a conference -- $20,000. We then took that fact and went to several other parts of the federal government, such as the Department of Agriculture and the National Institute of Education, and asked them to contribute, too. We ultimately put together about $50,000. One can leverage money.

Our informal group became the coordinating council, and I was the director of it. As we focused on what best to do with the money and the conference,

the choices were two: we could spend the money to bring in representatives of lots of the rural groups and organizations, or we could spend our money on preparation for the conference and have people pay their own way to get there. We could not do both, so we chose the second route. We knew that if we ever hoped to have any influence on policy in Washington, we had to have a better data-base. So we commissioned in advance 22 papers. We picked the people as carefully as we could, paid them a fairly decent sum, and had them write the best papers we could get.

The topics covered the waterfront of rural education issues. We had papers on special education, on Indian education, on migrant education, and on education for other minorities in rural areas; on finance, transportation, and energy; on the process of innovation in rural communities; on rural development, rural school achievement and attainment, service delivery, and many others. Each of these papers is available through the ERIC system*. These papers provide probably the most up-to-date summary of what is known about rural education that can be found.

We then used the papers in the conference. Over 100 organizations sent representatives. Probably one-third were really rural people; the others were representatives of organizations based in Washington, but concerned about rural education. We spent two full days pouring over these papers and fashioning from them a set of recommendations for changes in federal policy. The debate was hot and heavy. One night we stayed up all night putting

*Abstracts of the rural education seminar papers appear in Resources in Education as ERIC abstracts publications. Complete copies of each paper may be obtained in microfiche from any ERIC collection or ordered from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Computer Microfilm International Corp., 3030 North Fairfax Drive, Suite 200, Arlington, Virginia, 22201 in either fiche or paper copy. A full report on the seminar, The National Seminar on Rural Education, held in May, 1979, is available from NIE, Washington, DC, 20208.

together the final set of recommendations, and the next day we had a vote on the recommendations. It was almost like a political convention. Our intention was simultaneously to come up with an agenda of needed changes, and to put together a constituency that would back it. There must be both things, an agenda and a constituency, to be effective.

Important Findings About Rural America

The papers brought together a great many things about rural America that surprised many people.

First, rural America is difficult to define. By various definitions, between 25% and 35% of Americans live in rural America. That is a substantial chunk of the population.

Second, rural areas are very diverse. They range across almost any political, social, economic, racial, or religious dimension.

Third, as a whole, rural America is severely disadvantaged, worse than many inner-city areas. On indices of health, poverty, infant mortality, housing, and level of education; rural areas rank near the worst. If the rural constituency were organized like the inner-city constituencies, they could make the case that they were a special population and deserved special treatment just as migrants, Indians and bilinguals do. Unfortunately, nobody has put the constituency together to do that.

Fourth, outmigration from rural areas to urban areas had been massive for 100 years, but in 1970 it had reversed. We are one of the few countries in the world where more people are moving out of urban areas to rural areas. Indeed, some urban areas have experienced an absolute decline in population, so great has been the exodus. Also, this is not just movement to suburbs. The largest percentage growth has actually been in counties which do not even border on metropolitan areas. Since the initial population in these areas

was so low, the growth is not that massive in terms of actual numbers, but it is indicative.

Fifth, rural America is no longer agricultural. This usually surprises people. A quarter of workers in rural America work in industry. Next to that are people who work in retail trades, and next to that, people from the professions. Only 9% are involved in agriculture, forestry, and fishing combined. So rural America is not agricultural. It has been integrated into the larger economy, which means that it is affected by recessions and depressions just as everyone else and, more importantly, changes in agricultural policy do not affect rural areas all that much.

Finally, on all kinds of indices, rural governments are less able and less willing to provide services. There needs to be the development of an organizational infrastructure to provide many services. Many of you work in such organizations. In general, more such organizations are needed to deliver services adequately.

Which of these differences make a difference? Which differences are so important that the communities need to be treated differently in federal policy, and which can be ignored? Paul Nachtigal (one of our paper authors) has come up with a description of three different kinds of rural communities that we think require different policies.

First, there is one kind of rural community whose overriding characteristic is its poverty. Examples are communities in Appalachia, in the rural South, and what might be called "company towns," places where there is one major industry, where the wages are low, where the company leadership owns the town, and where there are no options for people.

Second, there is the type of rural community which is like the one people normally think of when they think of rural America. These tend to be

economically diverse (farming, manufacturing, recreation), located in the great plains or midwest, and they characteristically are not particularly poor. The quality of government and the availability of other kinds of services tends to be pretty high.

The third kind of community is what we call the "rapid transition" community. These are the outer suburbs of metropolitan areas where young families now have to go to afford housing, and any rural place where there is a major industrial expansion, such as strip mining in Montana, oil shale in Wyoming, the Alaska pipeline, or the MX missile project.

As far as we can tell these three categories represent the best way to think about rural areas. Each requires distinctly different federal law and policies to be served adequately.

What did we find out about schools? First of all, historically attempts to improve rural schools have passed through various phases. The first phase was based on the notion that the problem with rural schools is that they are not urban. The need is to create comprehensive elementary and secondary schools in rural areas through consolidation. Up until 35 or 40 years ago, there were two different systems of education. Most of rural America consisted of one- and two-room schools, and large comprehensive schools were found in cities.

Consolidation may represent the best implemented school reform in the history of education. We went in 30 years from approximately 144,000 school districts to 15,000 districts.

A second phase is one Paul Nachtigal calls the "necessarily existent rural school." This was the reluctant acknowledgment that there were places where schools were too far apart to be consolidated. It would be necessary in these cases to deliver services to these schools. Utah pioneered the

shared-services concept and intermediate agencies to deliver services, a trend that has been picked up nationally.

A third approach to reform is one which has not gotten far until now: an effort to preserve the unique strengths of small schools. Small schools have a lot of educational advantages. All of the people who moved to the cities over the last 100 years got their education in rural areas, and they did fine. (Daryl Hobbs, who gave the keynote address at the conference, called this a massive brain drain from rural areas). The acknowledgment that comprehensive schools are not all that great, and that rural schools have some particular strengths squares with my view, and I believe this view can only gain strength in the future.

The fourth major reform approach has been the federal funding of services to particular populations in rural areas. Put simply, the belief is that poor people are poor, whether they are urban or rural. The same for Indian children, migrant children, bilingual children. They ought to get roughly the same special services, regardless of whether they are rural or urban.

This last approach guides most of federal policy now in the usual federal style of pretending there are no differences between people or regions. Preserving the strengths of rural schools became the focus of most of the recommendations of the conference.

Recommendations of the National Seminar on Rural Education

There were twenty-seven recommendations. They called for the elimination of federal regulations that discriminate against rural areas, for the coordination of the delivery of services to rural areas, for the establishment of an office of rural education, and for the provision of support to service special populations, since the cost per unit of serving rural areas is higher. The recommendations also called for the development of locally relevant

curricula, and for the provision of technical assistance so rural districts can compete equally for federal funds. They called for the combining of monies for the purposes of administering different federal grants in rural areas. The recommendations called for setting up special teacher and administrator training programs for rural areas, for a report on successful approaches to rural education in other countries, for much more accurate data-gathering on rural America, and for research on about twenty or thirty topics that we felt were critical. They called for the development of guidance and counseling programs, and vocational programs appropriate for rural America, for special programs for rural women, and for an assessment of whether energy costs, particularly fuel for busses, now outweigh the cost-savings of consolidation.

Each recommendation is accompanied by a justification, and by examples of how it would work. The report is now available from NIE.*

The Influences of the Seminar

There are several events on which the seminar had an influence, although since the conference happened last May, not too much should be expected. Again, three to five years would be the expected time frame for results to appear.

The law creating the new Department of Education specified that a high official had to be responsible for rural education. In fact, it looks like there might be an Office of Rural Education. This degree of concern was partly engendered by our work in heightening sensitivity to rural issues.

The White House came out in December with a statement on small community and rural development policy. This is the first time that an administration has developed a national rural policy as well as a national urban policy. We know the seminar had influence on getting that to happen, and some of the seminar recommendations are in the policy document.

* For a copy of the report, write to the National Institute of Education, Washington, DC, 20208, and ask for the National Seminar on Rural Education report.

As a result of our going around and getting people to give us money to hold the seminar (I recommend that as a way of generating support), we now have a group of rural champions. The two key ones are the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Alex Mercure, and the man who originally supported us, Tom Minter. Dr. Minter has just been appointed the new Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education in the new Department of Education. There are at least a dozen others. Think about it. Four years ago, I was almost the only one, and none of my official responsibilities included rural education. Now there are a dozen highly placed advocates.

The seminar had some influence on improving data collection in rural areas. The Census Department previously would not report data from towns where the school population was 300 children or less, because privacy might be lost. Some individuals might be identifiable. They have now come up with some ways to mask that, and they have augmented the size of the rural sample. The National Center for Education Statistics has figured out a way to work with the Census Bureau to merge its enumeration districts with school districts. One of the problems in rural educational research is that school district boundaries are not conterminous with other boundaries, so it is very difficult to use census data. When the 1980 census becomes available in 1982, these new techniques should help us a great deal. Since rural areas do not have the money to collect critical data themselves, they are often shortchanged, even when formulas are used to distribute money. They often do not know how many of a given target group they do serve (as the "Child Find" project indicates). Thus, it is extremely important that large national surveys collect accurate rural data.

A last thing may be the most important. One of the reasons for the 100 years of outmigration from rural areas was the increased mechanization of agriculture. There were no jobs in rural America for the people who wanted to stay. One of the biggest reasons that mechanization happened as rapidly as it did is that there was a massive federal subsidy for the development of improved agricultural techniques through the agricultural research centers. These subsidies were used to develop mechanized agriculture as a way of expanding yield. As rural sociologists have known for some time, the effect of developing mechanized agriculture was to destroy rural communities, but sociologists could not get any attention for this in Washington. The agribusiness lobby was too strong.

Secretary Berglund about two weeks ago announced a reversal of this policy. The agricultural research stations will now do less work as a subsidy for agribusiness and do much more with preserving the quality of human life in rural America. This is a really important shift, for it signifies a different way of thinking about rural areas. The Department of Agriculture is now, for the first time, concerned about the quality of life in rural America. While our seminar did not directly influence this, we probably affected some of the people who made the decision.

Remaining Problems and Targets of Influence

This is about the end of the first year after the seminar, and there are a lot of things on which we have not had much influence yet. In the President's policy on small communities and rural development, the two weakest and most innocuous of our twenty-seven recommendations were included. We are lobbying hard to get them to put some others in, but they do not have a strong commitment to rural education in the document.

-30-

Within the new Department of Education, there is concern about who the new person with major responsibility for rural education will be, and whether it will be someone who has rural education as a major responsibility, or someone for whom it will be just one more responsibility out of hundreds. We need to fight to get the responsibility as high up as we can and as clear as possible.

The rural constituency is still an enormously scattered constituency. The National Rural Center, an organization called Rural America, People United for Rural Education, and groups like yourselves, for the most part, do not talk to each other. There is no one focused organization that tries to pull all the different groups together. Special education projects, for example, are not cooperating with projects that are focused on improving child care or early childhood education in rural areas, even though you are all natural allies. There is no common agenda of things for which to work, so those of us who could benefit from a consistent constituency wonder what to do next to create it. Still, keep up the pressure. Persist, and it will all come together.

Conclusion: Special Education

Let me finish by saying just a few things about special education as I knew it at the federal level. There is obviously an analogy between the passage of P.L. 94-142 and the Brown vs. Board of Education decision on school integration. There is now a legal mandate to integrate handicapped people, in the same way that school integration was mandated. It is a civil rights act, and you are a part of that.

Since the Brown decision twenty-five years ago, there has been an effort to identify forgotten minority groups and integrate them into the mainstream. When that mainstream is something hardly worth being in, it is something that

should make us all wonder. The mainstream must be of higher quality. This is particularly true in rural areas. All the groups who are trying to improve the quality of life in rural America need to work together. The successful integration of handicapped people into the mainstream of rural life will then be something that has been worth doing.

SYNOPSES OF HCEEP RURAL WORKSHOP

TOPICAL SESSIONS

Topic: Successful Practices in Securing Funding

Presenters: Jane Weil, Stueben, Maine
Corinne Garland, Lightfoot, Virginia

Chairperson: Tal Black, TADS

Presenters Jane Weil and Corinne Garland discussed successful techniques for approaching two sources of funding: (1) local, state, and federal agencies and (2) civic groups and individuals.

Addressing agency funding, Weil strongly urged participants to diversify funding sources as much as possible, stating that the greater number of agency funding sources, the better. Weil procured LEA funding by convincing the public schools that her program prevents and/or decreases the incidence of juvenile delinquency in retarded adolescents. Weil advocated becoming known by as many people as possible, and cultivating a reputation as a hard worker. She suggested that seeking state level committee appointments can improve visibility and thereby aid in receiving funds. Weil also suggested coordinating with other agencies whereever possible to decrease project costs and thus increase the availability of funds for other needs. She recommended sharing space, secretarial services, and equipment, and seeking funds jointly. Weil also suggested mailing project newsletters to the homes rather than offices of influential persons such as school board members, lawyers, physicians, councilmen and representatives.

Corinne Garland outlined the steps in running successful community fund-raising campaigns. The first step is to specify carefully how much money is needed, for what, and for how long. The tactic of stating exactly what the dollars will be used for -- for example, $30 will buy two hours of physical therapy -- helps donors to target their contributions and lends credibility to fund-raising efforts. The second step is to invest the responsibility for fund-raising in an individual or in a committee. A

financial advisory board can be established, composed of persons who have done well at fund-raising in the past. Finally, target potential donors and prioritize them. It is important to learn each target group's community role, philosophy, budget, "giving history," and local accountant. Garland urged getting to know "who's who" in family foundations.

When planning large-scale fund-raising activities, identifying an eye-catching or humorous gimmick can often boost a project above the horde of other fund-seekers. One successful crowd-pleaser was a "nut and fruitcake" sale for a mental health center.

Community-wide fund-raisers are meant to bring in as many people as possible. Some activities are more attractive to the general public than others (e.g. flea markets, gospel sing benefits, auctions, faculty-student spelling bees, amateur shows) and thus can deliver more dollars than a more narrowly focused effort. Providing receipts for contributions makes claiming tax deductions easier for people and also develops a mailing list for thank-you notes and future requests.

Both Garland and Weil stressed that projects need to become visible in their communities, regions, and states well before federal funding ends. Projects need to let everyone know who they are, what they do, and how they do it. The presenters also cautioned participants to be sensitive to current demands on any individual, group or agency, and attend to other community needs and projects as well as their own.

Topic: Stress on Rural Service Providers

Presenters: Donald Perras, Bridgeport, Connecticut

Chairperson: Tal Black, TADS

Don Perras began the session by relating several factors which typically contribute to stress and, ultimately, "burn out" among educators. One of these factors is inadequate professional support. Teachers are often ill-prepared by their training to cope with the demands being made on them, and inservice training frequently is too little and too late. Organizational structure, too, can cause stress, especially when job roles and descriptions are unclear or inflexible. Working conditions are often the most tangible contributors to stress for teachers. Low salaries, high workloads, and inadequate staffing and equipment are familiar circumstances. On a more personal level, the lack of opportunities for creative expression and self-actualization can sap an educator's vitality and commitment. Monotony and stagnation are more apt to threaten the "seasoned" professional than the eager novice. In the field of special education, the lack of consistent and prolonged progress by students forces teachers to lower their expectations and produces a self-image that is stress-inducing.

Perras identified a number of interpersonal factors that can make for stressful worklives. Supervisory relationships are often problematic; issues of power and authority take their toll. It is a rare organization in which personality and attitudes do not conflict to some extent. People in organizations are subject to the "contagion effect;" that is, one worker's negativity is apt to be caught by another and passed on.

Perras pointed out recent trends in education which are producing stress as a side effect. Teachers and administrators are more "accountable" than ever. Multi-disciplinary evaluation and placement, and teaching teams, while

good ideas on face value, involve more and more people working together, and thus have a higher potential for producing stress.

Perras observed that stress calls forth complex physiological, emotional, and cognitive responses from its victims. He asked the audience to think in terms of a three-stage reaction to stress. At the first level of response, stress triggers simple alarms in each of us. We feel thirsty and so drink, tense and so stretch, tired and so nap. Normally, we are able to regain our balance. When unresolved stresses begin to accumulate, however, we enter a state of resistance in which much of our physical, emotional, and mental energy is spent warding off the ill effects of stress. The third and final stage is exhaustion.

Perras reviewed the classic stages of burn-out, in terms of the educator's ability to reconcile his or her idealism to the sometimes harsh realities of everyday life in the field. Over time the educator is apt to move from a state of enthusiasm, when ideals are extraordinarily high, to stagnation, when the limits of environment, client abilities, and personal skills become apparent. The professional then enters a state of constant frustration characterized by anger and defensiveness. Finally, the educator's attitude deteriorates to one of apathy, in which all sense of caring has drained away. At this point, Perras explained, the professional under stress often feels compelled to formulate his dilemma in terms of "self versus job" preservation", and burn-out is imminent.

Perras urged that burn-out is not inevitable, and that pre-service and inservice training and supervisory personnel can do much to prevent or interrupt the burn-out cycle.

The approximately thirty participants next divided into small groups and listed, with facilitators' assistance, the major factors contributing

to staff stress in their projects. Touching upon nearly every issue raised by Perras, the responses present a cross-section of the pressures projects endure. The need to travel great distances was the most explicitly rural source of stress given. After transportation problems, three other complaints were heard more frequently than others: (1) the great number of responsibilities and lack of time to complete them; (2) relationships with sponsoring agencies lacking in clear and consistent policies, role definitions, expectations, reinforcement and feedback; and (3) high demands for interagency cooperation. The major lesson of this exercise may well be that rural providers are subject to much the same set of stress-inducers as educators everywhere.

Participants were asked to list techniques they have developed for coping with stress. As indicated by the following summary of participant-generated suggestions, projects go to great lengths to "lighten up" the work environment.

- Hold monthly mileage contests.
- Give little gag gifts.
- Play games at lunch.
- Meet monthly for lunch
- Initiate a Friday afternoon social club.
- Maintain a crazy atomosphere
- Play practical jokes on the director
- Conduct Bridge tournaments at lunch
- Hold staff potlucks
- Share jokes
- Give humorous awards and memos

Many projects recognized the benefits of mutual support in combating stress. These ideas were offered:

° Reinforce each other for accomplishments

° Talk a lot, share a lot

° Try to be a good listener

° Work to keep morale high and humor up

° Let staff ventilate

° Share perspective and keep long range in mind

° Let each staff member cope in his/her own way and style

° Try to be accessible as an administrator

Several project administrators shared their methods for containing pressures that lead to stress.

° Plan carefully so that time is used efficiently

° Hold weekly staff meetings and child staffings to keep communication open

° Hold weekly inservice meetings

° Send staff to conferences

° Encourage involvement in professional associations

° Allow staff to leave office to work elsewhere when tension is high

Participants seemed to realize, along with Perras, that only so much stress can be relieved by tinkering with the work environment. One key to professional longevity is the ability to leave work behind in the interest of a balanced life. Several participants urged colleagues to:

° Socialize with non-educators

° Leave work at the office

° Do something completely different

° Join an organization totally unrelated to work

° Take vacations

° Go on retreats

° Schedule family time

Finally, exercise, hobbies, and various other forms of recreation were promoted as important ways to take the edge off the day-to-day. Out there in rural America, tucked away in the folds of the HCEEP Network, one of your colleagues is out to beat stress by:

- Running/jogging
- Fishing a lot
- Playing basketball
- Running a chainsaw
- Smacking racquet balls
- Driving a pickup truck
- Taking lunch time walks
- Holding another job
- Shopping a lot

Topic: Establishing Community Communication and Awareness

Presenters: Bill Sadka, Meridian, Mississippi
David Kurtz, University of Tennessee, Nashville, Tennessee

Chairperson: David Gilderman, WESTAR

Suggestions and strategies for establishing awareness within a local community and facilitating communication among community groups and agencies was the topic of discussion during this session.

Bill Sadka, from project S.T.E.P. in Meridian, Mississippi, outlined several general purposes for community awareness. They are:

- to find children
- to provide services to children and families
- to solicit help and support
- to secure continuation funding
- to promote replications

Sadka offered an array of strategies for reaching the community with a message: (1) the use of media (e.g. television and radio spots, talk shows, newspaper articles, brochures placed at strategic locations or mailed); (2) displays or booths (at fund raising events, political rallies, and shopping centers); (3) flyers and posters placed at popular locations (community stores, banks, churches); and of course (4) personal contact. He urged working through and with diverse community organizations such as churches, community clubs, retarded citizens organizations, health departments, the food stamp office, Head Start Centers, mental health agencies, federal housing projects, and the PTA. Sadka cautioned against some pitfalls in community awareness activities. Among them were poor literature, weak or negative presentations, undesirable personal contacts, and becoming affiliated with issues having a strong personal or political impact.

David Kurtz has had experience in community awareness through two programs: the Regional Intervention Program (RIP) in Nashville, Tennessee, and the HICOMP program at University Park, Pennsylvania. He described his experience with three approaches to establishing community communication and awareness with parents. The first approach used mass media to increase parental knowledge of local resources, legal rights, child development, and the project itself. After a three-month concentrated effort, a pre/post survey of sixty parents indicated that their campaign had had virtually no impact on parents in terms of increased knowledge.

The second approach Kurtz described was aimed at increasing parents' knowledge by providing them with group instruction. The group instruction approach provided for extended and direct communication with parents. This approach was much more effective in increasing the knowledge of parents who

attended. Participants expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the instruction. The difficult part of this strategy is getting the parents to attend the meetings.

The third approach centered around a developmental screening program. With the help of an intermediate education agency, a census list of 191 preschool children was compiled. Letters were sent to parents inviting them to bring their child for a developmental screening at an assigned time. Screenings were held in a shopping center, a church, and at the county fair. A telephone procedure allowed for follow-up and adjustments in appointment times. The Denver Developmental Screening Test was used and re-screening was recommended for any child who failed or whose results were questionable.

Forty percent of the parents contacted brought their children to the screenings in response to the letters only. Another 20 percent participated after a follow-up phone call. Although the approach was successful in encouraging parents' participation, 20 percent of the parents whose children did not pass refused re-screening. While requiring considerable organization and manpower, the developmental screening approach is advantageous in that it reaches many parents; focuses on all, not just handicapped, children; requires no prior judgment by parents regarding their child's normality; and produces a high degree of parent satisfaction.

Topic: Securing Funding for Rural Programs

Presenters: Barbara Smith - CEC Governmental Relations, Reston, Virginia
Art Moreau - Peoria, Illinois
Judi Wallace - Washington, DC

Chairperson: Tal Black, TADS

Funding availability, and finding and securing funding were themes for this session, with the three presenters providing different perspectives on the general topics.

From her position in the Council for Exceptional Children's Governmental Relations Unit, Barbara Smith spoke to finding and securing funds from the public sector. She discussed funding sources at the federal, state, and local levels, including information on how such funds are dispersed. Barbara echoed a recurring workshop theme, stressing the need for political action on the part of those interested in seeing that young handicapped children and their families are served. In Smith's view, political activity consists not only of influencing those who control funding and policy, but also of becoming aware of how funds come into a state or local area and how they are dispersed. She recommended a CEC publication as being very useful for identifying potential sources of funds: Getting the Buck to Stop Here: A Guide to Federal Resources for Special Needs (stock 198).*

Exploring and securing funding in the private sector was the focus of Art Moreau's presentation. He reflected upon the wisdom of diversifying a program's funding base. According to Moreau, private sector funding sources, such as various types of foundations, corporations, bequests, and individual benefactors, are a huge and largely untapped resource for early childhood programs for the handicapped. He offered many useful suggestions and strategies for identifying and approaching these funding sources such as: (1) research a source thoroughly before approaching a prospective giver; (2) approach businesses in a business-like manner; and (3) make your request in terms of an "investment" in your program rather than a hand-out. Moreau also recommended The Foundation Center as an excellent resource for identifying potential foundation resources. The Center has two locations: 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY, 10010, (212/489-8610) and 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20036, (202/331-1400).

* The publication can be ordered from CEC Publications Sales, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia, 22091. The cost is $19.95 ($16.96 for CEC members) and must be prepaid.

Judi Wallace, who helped in the planning of the National Seminar on Rural Education (see keynote speech), identified several organizations that are working to improve funding opportunities for rural education. She recommended that rural service providers become proactive both in informing themselves of the activities of these various groups and organizations, and in supporting their efforts whenever possible. A directory of resources for HCEEP rural projects compiled by Wallace was provided to all participants. (See Appendix E)

Topic: Assessing Parent Needs and Planning Intervention Programs

Presenters: Vicki Dean, Tazewell, Tennessee
Judy Adams, Murray, Kentucky

Chairperson: Joyce Jackson, WESTAR

The development of intervention strategies based on parent needs is a task often faced by projects. Session participants heard two presentations on this subject and then broke into small groups for discussion.

Vicki Dean of the Clinch Powell Education Cooperative in Tazewell, Tennessee, outlined general questions to ask when including parents within an educational program. She first identified issues related to assessing parent needs that should be considered, such as: (1) What are your overall program goals for parents?; (2) What functions should needs assessment serve (e.g., provide a description of the current situation, identify intervention strategies as well as needs, and collect data for subsequent program evaluation)?; (3) What areas do you want to assess (e.g., socio-economic needs of the family, parents' stages of acceptance in the grieving process after the birth of a handicapped child, parent attitudes, etc.)?

Next Dean discussed factors to keep in mind when planning intervention objectives and strategies for parents. She recommended the use of regular

data collection and task analysis in setting and revising plans. She emphasized the importance of looking at the family interactions involved in working with a handicapped child and of determining the adult reinforcers which can be used in program management.

Judy Adams, the second speaker, presented her philosophy on the use of needs assessments with parents. Adams discussed a needs assessment instrument developed for use in the Project for Early Education of Exceptional Children (PEEEC), a center- and home-based project located in Murray, Kentucky. This instrument was devised to aid in developing a comprehensive individual program for each child by determining the needs of parents. The PEEEC teachers have four goals for working with parents: (1) to assist the parent in recognizing and understanding the child's handicaps; (2) to assist the parent in meeting the basic needs of the child and family; (3) to facilitate movement toward "acceptance" of the child; and (4) to establish appropriate individual family objectives for participation in the child's educational program and to assist the parent in learning and utilizing intervention strategies with the child. Each of these goals has been broken down into several specific objectives in the assessment instrument. After assessing the parents' progress toward meeting the goals in these areas, the teacher can then formulate individualized objectives to meet the needs of each parent. In addition, profiles of parents can be compiled to show group trends and needs. These profiles can be used to help cluster parents for joint activities.

Participants broke into small groups and discussed the following three topics: (1) building family support systems both within and outside the family; (2) helping improve parent-to-parent interactions; and (3) dealing with problems of parent isolation from services, from other parents, and from experience with handicapping conditions.

Topic: What Other Fields Have Learned About Serving Rural Clients

Presenters: Jon Peters, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee
Joylean Sampson, Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tennessee
Richard Couto, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee
Dorsey Walker, Section, Alabama

Chairperson: Harris Gabel, George Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

A panel composed of representatives from a variety of human service organizations active in rural areas was assembled for the topical session. Presenters from the fields of social services (Sampson), health (Couto), the church (Walker), agriculture and adult education (Peters) shared the perspectives of their fields on serving rural clients.

Joylean Sampson, Director of the Human Services Research Unit at Tennessee State University, indicated that social work in rural areas has seen periods of expansion and contraction. Today, social welfare is viewed as an institution which provides continuous support to rural clients, rather than intermittent crisis intervention. This current thinking requires the social worker to work as a generalist, making efficient use of all available resources.

Sampson recommended that people working in rural areas carefully consider the value systems of the community and seek sanction by the community of any proposed service. Sampson stressed that rural people must be involved in policy-making in order to accept innovation.

Jon Peters, from the Adult Education Department at the University of Tennessee, drew upon research in adult education that views the rural client as an adult learner/problem-solver. He observed that the methods adults use to solve problems may often be out of phase with the expectations of educators or other helpers. To accept help willingly, an adult learner

must first see a need. Secondly, the adult learner must recognize that the problem cannot be solved by drawing upon personal experience. Only at this point is the adult learner ready to turn to "outside" sources. Peters stated that educators often fail to bring people to this stage of readiness before providing help. He emphasized the importance of being sensitive to the prior experience of rural people in order to understand their "readiness" for the help being offered. One example of developing "readiness" in a community was drawn from the work of a county agricultural agent. In introducing new agricultural technology, one person in the community is identified as being willing to try the innovation. His success is observed by others, and they, in turn, become "ready" to acknowledge a need for learning about the new technology. Peters suggested that this strategy might also be applied to intervention with families of handicapped children.

Richard Couto, Director of Student Project Health Services at Vanderbilt University, proposed that the concept of "community" is an important key to establishing a successful service program. While the concept of community in rural areas is under severe stress from internal and external pressures, introducing services can catalyze a reassertion of community spirit. It is essential to locate and involve leadership within the community in order to be successful. Couto recommended seeking out those persons having histories of involvement, strong economic bases, and effective communication networks.

Dorsey Walker is the leader of the United Methodist Cooperative Ministry in rural Alabama. Walker observed that in rural areas, clergy are often seen as authorities and thereby have an open-door connection to most parts

of the community. Walker noted that because of this status, the clergy can help service-providers become acquainted with community leaders, identify the needs and values of a community, and organize meetings to introduce service programs to the community. He stressed the importance of approaching rural communities first as friends, and second as service-providers.

Topic: Influencing Decision-Makers

Presenters: Lillie Bogan - Ochlocknee, Georgia
Floyd Dennis - Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee
Louise Phillips - Magnolia, Arkansas

Chairperson: Mike Woodard

Three types of decison-makers (legislators, private and public agency leaders, and public school personnel) and the principles for influencing these and other decision-makers were the topics of this session's discussion.

Floyd Dennis of Vanderbilt University focused on influencing legislators. He stressed the importance of becoming familiar with the policies and preferences of key legislators, including identifying and establishing relationships with the legislators' "significant others." He described the use of an ecological map system for outlining who these people are. Dennis suggested that it is important to (1) share recognition for successes, (2) recognize that legislators are busy with many constituents and accept what they do (or don't do) graciously; and (3) communicate in the legislators' language, taking time to learn their vernacular and to explain special education jargon.

Lillie Bogan dealt with influencing public and private agencies (e.g., Society for Crippled Children, departments of family and children's services, mental health agencies, Lion's clubs, Jaycees, and medical clinics). She recommended a problem-analysis approach to influencing other agencies that

included identifying specific problems, determining the discrepancy between current status and future goals, and developing strategies that result in long-term input and influence. Bogan made the following recommendations:

1. Include personnel from other agencies on your project advisory board.
2. Make your project visible to agencies by providing opportunites for observation.
3. Seek out opportunities for exchanging resources with other agencies, such as inservice workshops.
4. Identify one contact person in each agency and talk with that person on a regular basis.

Louise Phillips addressed her attention to influencing public school personnel. She believes that school systems are the agency of choice for continuing a demonstration program because public schools have taxing power, state support, and offer continuous supervision to programs. She described the busy world of superintendents of schools, noting how important it is to make appointments at their convenience. Phillips encouraged developing a positive attitude toward superintendents and other public school decision-makers, the large majority of whom "want to do what is needed." Phillips strongly recommended involving public school personnel at the earliest possible stage of program development. "Talk with them before you write proposals. Let them have input at all levels, and every year, if you expect to move your program into the public schools, or acquire their long-term support. Keep in mind that public schools often plan three, four, and five years in advance. Be willing to work along with them so you're included in their long-term plans." Phillips went further to give the following suggestions:

1. Be sure you know and can explain how your program fulfills a vital community need.
2. Know your program costs and be able to communicate them in a way that shows the costs to be reasonable.

3. Use parents effectively in influencing decision-makers; enlist the support of parents of non-handicapped children as well as handicapped.
4. Seek to influence people in your community before going on to the state legislature.

Topic: Cost-Effective Delivery Strategies

Presenters: Neil Schortinghuis - Portage, Wisconsin
Dale Gentry - University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho
Tom Clark - Utah State University, Logan, Utah

Chairperson: Tal Black

The purpose of this session was to present some examples of service delivery strategies and the costs of those strategies. The presentations also identified several issues related to analyzing the costs of service delivery models, including separating model development costs from actual service costs and calculating cost-per-child ratios.

Neil Schortinghuis compared the costs of two Portage Project service delivery strategies: a center-based program and a home visiting program. The center-based classroom serves 25-30 children four days per week. The fifth day is used for planning; afternoon home visits are made once every two weeks. The yearly cost of the center-based program is $2,525 - $3,031 per child, depending upon the number of children in the classroom. The home-based program provides 36 home visits per year to 45 children. The cost per child for the home-based program is $1,553. The Portage Project found no significant differences in the progress of children between the home-based and center-based programs, but the difference in costs is obvious. One major factor contributing to the higher cost of the center-based pro-

gram was the inclusion of home visits to ensure parent involvement. Schortinghuis noted that the major cost of both programs was staff salaries and benefits.

Dale Gentry from Moscow, Idaho, also presented cost figures comparing center-based and home-based delivery strategies. His analysis compared the hourly costs per child, and included only direct service time to the child, planning time, and travel time. Administrative and other indirect costs were not included in the analysis. Gentry found the costs for home-besed programs ranging from $13.58 to $32.23 per hour, with travel and planning time variability accounting for the spread. The center-based program -- with no transportation costs, but some variability in planning time -- cost from $8.46 to $12.71 per hour. The cost of follow-up services for the children was $10.86 per hour.

Tom Clark, whose Ski-High project at Utah State University is a statewide program serving hearing-impaired infants and preschoolers, presented a strategy for home-based intervention. The Ski-High Program serves about 80 children across the State of Utah at an average cost of $1,475 per child per eleven-month year, or about $25.48 per visit. These figures account for all the costs of the program, including audiological examinations, purchasing and maintaining hearing aids, training and supervising home visitors throughout the state, and other administrative support costs.

The hiring of part-time home visitors through a contractual arrangement rather than employing full-time staff, is the principle reason this model is so cost effective. When a child needing help enters the Ski-High program, a qualified person in or near the child's community is identified, hired through an "enabling contract," and trained to provide home instruction to the child and parents. The home visitor is then paid only for the time actually spent working for the program. Since the home visitors are

not salaried employees, the cost of fringe benefits such as retirement, health insurance, and paid vacations are avoided. More importantly, the cost of paying for staff when they are not actually providing services is virtually eliminated. Another advantage of the model is that home visits are scheduled whenever mutually convenient for the home visitor and the family, even if that means evenings and weekends.

Clark reported that home visitors are paid according to the following schedule: $14 per home visit, $6 per hour travel time, $7 per hour consultation, $18 for a half-day inservice training, and $34 for a full-day inservice training.

Topic: Recruiting Staff for Rural Areas

Presenters: Sandy Hazen - OSE
Glen Casto - Utah State University, Logan, Utah
Taylor Cook - Lewisburg, Tennessee
Richard Cleveland - Columbia, Tennessee

Chairperson: Steve Threet, Columbia, Tennessee

Recruiting and keeping staff in rural areas is a problem for many projects, and was the topic of discussion during this session. Sandy Hazen from OSE identified factors contributing to staff dissatisfaction and turnover in rural HCEEP programs, including low wages, geographic isolation and lack of cultural stimulation. Since the early childhood/special education professional is typically female, a major source of staff instability results from wives leaving their positions to follow their "primary wage earner" husbands. Hazen suggested that we develop resources other than our traditional institutions of higher learning to eliminate the shortages of qualified personnel in rural programs.

Glen Casto, director of a multi-state outreach project based in Utah, has found that recruiting personnel with qualifications, interests, and attitudes consistent with rural lifestyles lessens the likelihood of staff

being dissatisfied and unsuccessful in their jobs. He tries to assess a prospective employee's strengths and needs in terms of the following criteria:

1. acceptance of rural culture
2. rural interests
3. socially appropriate behavior
4. personal satisfaction with rural activities
5. knowledge of local history, geography, politics
6. ability to adapt to new, strange, and different conditions
7. local and long-distance support systems

Using this approach, Casto has been able to identify those candidates who may never be able to accomodate successfully to life in a small, rural community. The assessment also identifies moderately "at-risk" candidates; perhaps its greatest usefulness is in alerting these persons to personal and cultural points of vulnerability. With the project's assistance, the employee sets goals and plans activities intended to help him or her over the rough spots of the transition. Ongoing support of staff in remote areas is a major concern of the project. Casto feels that technical assistance and the project-wide communications system are helping prevent the incidences of staff "burn-out."

Taylor Cook and Dick Cleveland are executives with Hospital Affiliates International and General Electric Corporation, respectively. Both men are currently based in rural areas. They shared several of their techniques for recruiting and maintaining personnel. Cook's most successful approach is to find and train local people. He often finds candidates by contacting realtors, civic clubs, welcome wagons and personnel directors of local businesses. Through these sources he identifies persons new to the community -- frequently unemployed spouses of husbands who are moving in to take jobs -- and contacts them. His methods for retaining employees are effective. Career

goals are identified, and addressed by on-the-job training and continuing education. Performance is rewarded by incentives and promotion; upward mobility in the organization is strongly encouraged.

While General Electric has an adequate pool of candidates within its organization, the corporation makes extensive efforts to attract employees to rural areas and to facilitate the actual move to the new location, said presenter Dick Cleveland. Candidates, and often spouses, are flown to rural sites where they are wined, dined, and generally introduced to the joys of country living. Once a decision to relocate is made, G.E. is generous in its financial and personal support to the moving family. The corporation assumes the cost of the move, including incurred furnishing needs like new carpets and drapes. Currently G.E. is subsidizing the difference in mortgage rates between the old and new homes. Assistance is provided to help the family find the services they need in the new community.

Topic: Interagency Coordination: Best Practices

Presenters: Harris Gabel, George Peabody College of Vanderbilt University
Jim Fitch, Owensboro, Kentucky
Steve Guedet, Rockford, Illinois

Chairperson: Bill Woodrich, Macomb, Illinois

This session focused on practices which have been found to be effective in facilitating interagency coordination. Recognizing the importance of obtaining cooperation in rural areas where resources are scattered presenters agreed on the basic principles that are necessary for successful interagency cooperation. These techniques included: maintaining visibility and credibility; generous use of the "personal touch;" preference for "win-win" strategies when dealing with other agencies; prompt follow-up; and openness of communication

channels. All presenters stressed the importance of following these principles from the beginning of the project.

Presenters also discussed project implementation as a stimulus to interagency coordination, placing particular emphasis on the use of mutual training activities as a vehicle for coordination. Among the side benefits of shared training experiences are: (1) information exchange between agencies about referrals, services, personnel, and eligibility criteria; (2) information and coordination regarding individual case management; and (3) community organization in terms of planning future services to children.

Topic: Interagency Troubleshooting

Presenters: Rena Wheeler, Billings, Montana
Bill Hoehle, Fargo, North Dakota
Christine Bartlett, Augusta, Maine

Chairperson: Patricia Hutinger, Macomb, Illinois

Even agencies with the best of intentions can encounter problems when they attempt to coordinate their services. Rather than focusing on trouble-shooting problems after they arise, the presenters instead offered suggestions for avoiding potential problems.

Rena Wheeler of Project Sunrise discussed three types of problems that block interagency coordination at the local level: (1) money; (2) differences in philosophical and theoretical perspective; and (3) "ego" problems. Wheeler advocated choosing the path of least resistance in resolving philosophical differences, saying that the goal of cooperation is usually far more important than the promotion of one's own point of view to the exclusion of others. She suggested minimizing potential ego and turf problems by referring clients to other agencies with a note saying who referred them, documenting

positive exchanges with individuals at other agencies, writing letters to supervisors in other agencies citing the cooperativeness of their staff, cultivating mutual support systems, and matching staff from different agencies to get specific jobs done.

Wheeler feels that project staff need to be good salespersons of not just their own, but other valuable services in the community. She encouraged clarifying the who, why and how of various services, as well as developing a "mutual admiration society" with other agencies in the community.

Bill Hoehle from Children's Services addressed four areas of concern: (1) what to do to prevent problems; (2) case management; (3) medical-educational interface; and (4) university cooperation. For Hoehle, the critical first step is defining child and family needs. Following a definition of needs, a referral system is established. At Children's Services, progress reports are sent every six months to the referring agency, addressed specifically to the individual who made the referral. As for inter-agency case management, Hoehle recommended using memoranda agreements which specify step-by-step the services to be provided and by whom. Medical-educational interface can be accomplished through common staff meetings, personal contact, feedback, and follow-through. Cooperation with a university can provide tremendous resources for a project. Spending a small amount of time in supervising students can net a much greater return in terms of direct services and resource assistance.

Christine Bartlett, director of the State Implementation Grant in Maine, discussed how to avoid problems at the state level. She emphasized the importance of knowing state and local politics, and of having a proactive rather than reactive perspective. She strongly urged familiarity with the structures of the state legislature, state administrative office, governor's office and staff, and state departments. Bartlett suggested learning the key people in

each structure, their histories, and the pressures with which they are contending. She also suggested thinking about the state's readiness for interagency agreements in terms of commitment from local and regional staff, initiation points for agreements (state, regional, or local), realistic timelines and optimal strategies for developing interagency agreements.

The presenters urged projects to get to know their contact persons well, see from the other person's perspective, keep project staff informed of state and local politics, and be cautious about generalizing an individual's response into that of an agency.

Topic: Rural Child Find: A Poster Party

Presenters: Judy Adams, Murray, Kentucky
Barbara Hanners, Columbus, Mississippi
Corinne Garland, Lightfoot, Virginia
Vicki Wozniak, Alpena, Michigan
Tom Miller, Alpena, Michigan

Chairpersons: Pennie Anderson, Macomb, Illinois
Mary Strode, Macomb, Illinois

Presenters displayed print and audio-visual materials used by their projects in successful rural child find efforts. Staff were on hand to answer participants' questions. Many of the print materials are available on request from the following HCEEP projects:

-- Macomb 0-3 Project: A Rural Child/Parent Service
27 Horrabin Hall
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455
(309) 298-1634

-- Project for Early Education of Exceptional Children (PEEEC)
Special Education Building
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky 42071
(502) 762-6965

-- TELSTAR
1691 M 32, West
Alpena, Michigan 49707
(517) 354-3101

-- Child Development Resources Outreach Project (CDR)
P. O. Box 299
Lightfoot, Virginia 23090
(804) 565-0303

Topic: Evaluation of Parent Training and Education Programs in Rural Areas

Presenter: Bill Hoehle, Fargo, North Dakota

Chairperson: Joyce Jackson, WESTAR

The purpose of this session was to present a nuts-and-bolts approach to evaluation, emphasizing that complex and sophisticated statistics are not always necessary. Bill Hoehle, Director of Children's Services at Southeast Mental Health and Retardation Center, Fargo, North Dakota, presented the goals and objectives of the evaluation of the Comprehensive Preschool Program for Rural and Nonurban Areas. This program was recently validated by the Joint Dissemination and Review Panel. Some of the goals of this program's evaluation included gathering information on the impact of the program on parents and children, facilitating model development (materials for dissemination), and documenting the effectiveness of the program.

The specific program component presented was the evaluation of Parents and Children Together (PACT), a parent education program. This program provides a high degree of parental involvement (parent attendance was maintained throughout the program), enhances learning of content material concerning developmental areas, trains parents to implement successfully behavior change programs, and increases parents' positive attitudes toward their children.

Evidence of program effectiveness of the PACT Program consists of (1) the number of PACT groups conducted, (2) the number of parents and children served, (3) the frequency of attendance, and (4) pre-/posttest score comparisons on the contents of the learning packets. In order to assess the direct effects of parent participation in PACT on children's behavior, a single-subject design was used to evaluate behavior management projects that

were undertaken by parents. Parents collected the data on the PACT groups, with the PACT staff occasionally performing reliability checks.

The data presented showed that the PACT Program maintained a high rate of parent attendance. Additionally, the data indicated a positive gain in the cognitive skills of parents as revealed in the pre-/posttest comparisons. The training was successful in teaching parents to design and carry out behavior change projects for their own children in the home. In addition to these successes, a positive increase in parental attitudes toward their children was noted.

Topic: Transportation Problems

Presenter: Jim Groen, Michigan Department of Social Services

Chairperson: Mike Woodard, TADS

Transportation can be one of the major problems faced by rural human service organizations. Jim Groen, from the Michigan Department of Social Services, addressed several transportation issues, including limiting costs, federal and state initiatives, funding sources, and interagency efforts.

A federal task force, the Rural Transportation Initiative Task Force, was formed in 1979 and included representation from Public Health, HEW, the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Commerce. The focus of the task force was to facilitate the coordination of human service agency transportation with public transportation. Four issues were considered: insurance, existing systems improvements, railroad branch revitalization, and ridesharing. Groen presented task force recommendations in these areas and described innovative practices. He suggested that more efforts should be directed to interagency cooperation, with human services agencies moving away from serving categorical populations. With a breakdown of the present

"exclusive service" attitude in transportation, avenues of cooperation may be opened.

Groen identified some currently feasible methods for transportation planning, including: (1) picking up clients of many agencies, plus developing general public or single-route runs; (2) obtaining mileage reimbursement for agency specific vehicles having an open door policy; (3) applying to state departments for mileage reimbursement; (4) directing main lines of public transit systems via major population destinations, notably human service agencies; (5) building new agencies on transit main lines; and (6) negotiating ride-sharing with the private sector.

Following Groen's presentation, the seventeen participants were each asked to list: (1) specific factors contributing to transportation problems faced by his or her project and (2) solutions developed by his or her project to meet transportation problems. The rural transportation problems that emerged follow:

1. Distance
2. Lack of public transportation
3. Cost
4. Parents' inability to transport their children
5. Lack of support from public schools and other service agencies
6. Poor roads and rough weather

The number and variety of solutions developed to meet local transportation needs once again reflects the diversity and creativity of HCEEP projects. All solutions supplied by participants are reproduced here:

- Use UMTA (Urban Mass Transit Authority) XVIB2 money through local ARC for bus purchase.
- See some families biweekly instead of weekly.
- Ask social workers to transport individual children.

- Check bus regulations; the county school bus will let a 4-year old ride with supervision of his older sibling.
- Pay parents $.12 a mile to use their own cars. (Parents report that they are now losing money at this rate.)
- Ask a local car dealer to donate car for just the cost of insurance and licensing.
- Consolidate various bus runs, adapting time schedules to the special service.
- Offer several different pick-up locations where parents can drive and meet other transportation.
- Ask staff to use their own cars to transport parents and children to clinics.
- Have child live with foster parents close to the school during the week and go home on weekends.
- Ask teachers to car pool when possible.
- Encourage families to use Medicaid transportation when possible and appropriate.
- Suggest that parents carpool to clinic operations.
- Contact March of Dimes/Easter Seals to get financial help for parents (e.g., gas costs or volunteers).
- Contact other agencies in town who are willing to transport on volunteer basis (Senior Citizens Groups).
- Check to see if public schools will transport a child if a bus passes the child's home and parents ride too.
- Ask teachers in same area to pick up children.
- Use "foster grandparents" as aides on buses.
- Contract with individually selected commuters who take children home after their shifts for a set free.
- Contract with a local "Dial-A-Ride."

ISSUES OF CONCERN

During the concurrent small group presentations, specially designated note-takers were asked to record questions or problems that were of high interest to the audience and appeared to be issues for rural service providers. This section of the document presents the issues which surfaced. Although individual sessions addressed a variety of topics, the issues generated and recorded fell into the following six categories: (1) direct service delivery; (2) interagency coordination; (3) funding and policy decisions; (4) training and staff-related concerns; (5) parent/family involvement; and (6) working in the rural community.

The issues are simply listed by category. No attempt has been made here to address or comment on these issues. Some issues were addressed directly or indirectly at the workshop and are included in the synopsis section of this document.

DIRECT SERVICE DELIVERY

Within the category of direct service delivery, the issues can be divided into three separate subcategories: methods/types of service delivery, cost effectiveness of delivery strategies, and establishing community awareness. Cost issues surface more often than others in this category.

Issues

Methods/Types of Service Delivery

- °How can programs in rural areas accomodate a variety of handicapping conditions?
- °How do we deal with subcultures?
- °How do we obtain support services?
- °How do you capture some of the non-child-related benefits of the project (e.g., day-care function freeing the mother for work)?
- °How do we improve follow-up of services after screening by volunteers?

Cost Effectiveness of Delivery Strategies

- °What alternatives are available for serving children in rural areas, given the rapidly increasing costs of transportation and the anticipated decrease in the availability of gasoline?

Issues

°How can demonstration projects separate out the costs of delivering services from the costs of model development?

°What are some strategies for estimating the payoff of early intervention (e.g., educational savings as a result of early intervention)?

°How does one ascertain the total service cost to a child, including services other than those offered by a project?

°How can projects determine what is the the most effective method of reaching people in terms of project time, productivity, and cost?

Establishing Community Awareness

°What are some effective means of fostering community awareness and gathering information about the community?

INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

The issues mentioned which dealt with interagency coordination revolved around methods of establishing interagency cooperation/coordination with other unspecified programs. Specific issues dealt with the need for establishing cooperative channels with medical and other health-related agencies as well as with transportation agencies. The issue of "other agency resistance" was also discussed.

°How do you facilitate long term coordination after the demonstration period ends?

°What are some techniques for developing and improving relationships with medical/public health personnel?

°How does a project determine what should be documented concerning interagency relationships?

°When does other agency resistance reach a critical point, and what strategies would be helpful in diminishing resistance?

°Are there models for interagency cooperatives in transportation (i.e., public schools, Senior Citizens, day care, "ride sharing")?

FUNDING AND POLICY DECISIONS

Issues in the area of obtaining funding and influencing policy decisions reiterated the need for informed action.

Issues

°What are the how-tos of getting continued funding after demonstration?

°How can we increase our knowledge of funding sources?

°What are the funding sources for rural transportation?

°How can we become more politically aware and active (e.g., keeping lawmakers informed about our projects and our future needs)?

°How do you work with legislators that are negative? What are some positive methods for working with legislatures? When is a good time to begin communication with legislators?

TRAINING AND STAFF-RELATED CONCERNS

The range of issues which fell into the category of training and staff-related concerns included quality of staff, inservice activities, management/staff communication, and recruiting difficulties.

Issues

°How can we upgrade salaries and benefits for rural professionals?

°How can we attract good people and retain them?

°How do we develop new methods of training professionals which serve the needs of rural areas?

°How do we find qualified persons to do inservice training?

°Where do we get training resources after project funding ends?

°How do we improve communication between administrators and staff?

PARENT AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

The number and variety of issues related to parent and family involvement reflect the importance of this program area to HCEEP projects in rural areas.

Issues

°How do we get parents to participate in planned activities?

°What do we do when parents are insufficiently educated?

°How can the isolation of parents be alleviated?

°How can we measure the extent to which parents use the information they learn in our projects and parent group meetings?

°How can we inform parents about available services, including fees and financial assistance?

°How can we enhance family support systems?

°How can we help parents accept their handicapped child?

°How can we help parents understand their child's handicap?

°How can we mobilize the support of the extended family?

°How can we support parents of terminally ill children?

°How can we inform parents of their child's educational rights?

°How can we increase the sensitivity of other agencies to the family situation?

WORKING IN THE RURAL COMMUNITY

Issues

°How can major gaps in social services in rural communities be filled?

°How can we get rural communities to accept what we have to offer?

°How can rural communities be mobilized to support the handicapped child and his family?

Summary

It appears that workshop participants share a number of common concerns. Many of these were addressed in this workshop; others await answers which may be provided at future HCEEP rural workshops. It is interesting to note the frequent concern about transportation. Apparently this issue has implications for several aspects of rural program functioning. The issues listed above may guide future rural workshop planning.

HCEEP RURAL WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Participants were requested to evaluate the workshop at the close of the meeting. Fifty-one of the 104 workshop participants completed the evaluation questionnaire (See Appendix F). Respondents described their overall satisfaction with the meeting and rated the extent to which each workshop purpose was met. Sessions were evaluated in terms of quality and usefulness. Open-ended questions assessed strengths and weaknesses of the meeting as well as interest in future rural workshops. Additional comments concerning the value of the meeting; and location, organization and accommodations were elicited. This chapter summarizes the responses concerning these workshop components.

OVERALL SATISFACTION. Participants rated their overall satisfaction with the workshop on a 7-point scale, with 7 as the highest rating. The mean, based on 48 responses, was 6.02. This positive rating indicates that the workshop provided a very satisfactory learning experience for the participants.

PURPOSES OF WORKSHOP ACHIEVED. Participant responses suggest that all workshop purposes were well achieved (see Table 1). The workshop objectives "to identify issues and needs of rural projects" and "to facilitate communication and cooperation among rural HCEEP projects" received the most positive ratings.

TABLE 1
Extent to Which Workshop Purposes
Were Achieved

Purpose	N	Mean
A. To identify issues and needs of rural projects.	50	6.06
B. To facilitate communication and cooperation among rural HCEEP projects.	51	6.02
C. To exchange information and ideas on best practices.	51	5.69
D. To identify new developments and perspectives from other fields serving rural areas.	47	5.15

Note. Ratings on a 7-point scale, with 7 being the most positive.

QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF SESSIONS. Sessions addressing 14 topics of interest were rated for their quality and usefulness. As can be seen in Table 2, participants gave most sessions very positive ratings. The means for both quality and usefulness of 11 of the sessions were above 5.0 on a 7-point scale. "Successful Practices for Securing Funding" and "Stress on Rural Service Providers" received particularly high ratings in both areas. In general, the ratings imply that the sessions were well presented and that their content was appropriate in terms of its usefulness and applicability for participants.

TABLE 2
Quality and Usefulness of Workshop Sessions

	Session	Quality		Usefulness	
		N	Mean	N	Mean
1.	Successful Practices for Securing Funding	7	6.85	7	6.85
2.	Stress on Rural Service Providers	26	6.61	25	6.52
3.	Establishing Community Communication and Awareness	18	5.83	17	6.18
4.	Securing Funding for Rural Programs	17	5.82	17	6.11
5.	Assessing Parent Needs and Planning Intervention Programs	26	5.88	25	5.92
6.	What Other Fields Have Learned	15	5.93	15	5.86
7.	Influencing Decision-Makers	16	5.62	16	5.75
8.	Cost-Effective Delivery Strategies	28	5.50	27	5.55
9.	Recruiting Staff for Rural Areas	16	5.37	15	5.33
10.	Interagency Coordination: Best Practices	12	5.58	12	5.16
11.	Interagency Troubleshooting	9	5.33	8	5.12
12.	Rural Child Find: A Poster Party	14	4.78	14	4.71
13.	Evaluation of Parent Training and Education Programs	19	3.57	19	3.89
14.	Transportation Problems	16	4.06	15	3.66

Note. Ratings on a 7-point scale, with 7 being the most positive.

SYNTHESIS OF WRITTEN COMMENTS

OVERALL WORKSHOP

Participants unanimously indicated that the workshop was a worthwhile investment of time and effort. Many individuals thought the most positive aspect of the meeting was the sharing of information with others who provide services in rural areas. Several respondents believed the diversity of individuals gathered together to focus on common problems and the interaction among participants and presenters were strengths of the meeting. Exposure to different viewpoints and gaining new perspectives were also mentioned as aspects which contributed to the usefulness of the workshop.

INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS

Close to one-fourth of the respondents stated that the utility of the information presented in individual sessions was the most positive aspect of the workshop. A few others mentioned the variety of topics addressed during the meeting as its greatest strength. Several participants believed that including experts from outside the HCEEP Network enhanced individual sessions and provided the broader insight that they felt was essential to the success of the workshop.

Most comments on particular sessions were complimentary in nature. One-third of the respondents specifically mentioned "Stress on Rural Service Providers" as a very informative presentation which should have been held more than once. Many participants praised the excellent presentation and useful information of "Securing Funding for Rural Programs." Others complimented the organization and usefulness of "Assessing Parent Needs and Planning Intervention Programs" and "Recruiting Staff for Rural Areas."

Weaker aspects relating to individual sessions were also mentioned in the responses. Among those cited were poor organization on the part of particular presenters, unrealistic suggestions, and an overemphasis on problems rather than solutions. Another weakness of certain sessions dealt with the presentation of information too specific to the speaker's project and therefore not always applicable to the audience.

ORGANIZATION

Many comments praised the manner in which the workshop was organized. Participants believed the schedule was well paced and full but allowed adequate time for interaction among participants between session periods. A few individuals thought there were too many concurrent sessions, limiting the number which could be attended. Some people indicated certain topics were repeated too often, whereas others were not offered often enough. A few individuals commented that sessions were too short for adequate participant-presenter dialogue. However, most respondents complimented the efforts of TADS, WESTAR, and the Rural Consortium in organizing and conducting the Rural Workshop. Several participants commended the workshop organizers for providing information on social activities.

LOCATION/ACCOMMODATIONS

The location and hotel accommodations were considered excellent by most participants. A few individuals thought the hotel should have been located nearer to downtown Nashville and others indicated the hotel costs were prohibitive.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE WORKSHOPS

Many individuals suggested further communication among rural HCEEP projects and specifically requested future meetings of rural service providers. These individual topics were specified:

°Expansion and follow-up on the 1980 session topics

°Research on rural services

°Activities of other nonurban professionals, including health care providers

°Best practices among rural early childhood special education programs

°Problem-solving relating to rural issues

°Dissemination techniques for rural programs

°Stress on service providers, especially as it affects the recruitment of staff

°Working within a "rural culture"

°Public and private funding sources

°Effecting change in public policy

°Time management

°Child advocacy

°Parent assessment and involvement

°Child assessment

°P.L. 94-142

°Transition into public schools

°Transportation problems

SUMMARY

Workshop evaluation results indicate that workshop purposes were more than adequately

met and that most participants found individual sessions of use and of high quality. It is evident from quantitative data and written comments that the 1980 HCEEP Rural Workshop was successful in promoting the sharing of information and ideas among those who provide services to young, handicapped children in rural areas.

Appendix A

Rural Workshop Interest Survey

MEMORANDUM

TO: All HCEEP Projects

FROM: Tal Black, Associate Director, TADS
Karen Morris, Assistant Coordinator, WESTAR

A workshop for the HCEEP Network on the general topic, serving young handicapped children and families in rural areas, is now being planned by TADS and WESTAR. It will be held March 12-15, 1980, in Nashville, Tennessee. Participants will attend at their own or project's expense.

Many projects have expressed interest in a workshop that focuses on the unique problems and concerns rural America faces in providing early education for the handicapped. A consortium of rural projects is assisting in the planning of this workshop through a committee chaired by Harris Gabel, FIT Project, Nashville, Tennessee.

The purposes of the workshop are:

a. to identify issues and needs of rural projects
b. to facilitate communication and cooperation
c. to exchange information and ideas on best practices
d. to identify new developments from other fields.

But who are the HCEEP projects serving rural areas? What are their concerns? What are their strengths? Enclosed is an interest survey designed to let us know the topics that are of high interest to HCEEP projects and who is considering attending the workshop. The responses will be used in planning the workshop agenda. A summary report of the results will be shared with those indicating an interest.

Please fill out the enclosed questionnaire (it's not as long as it looks!) and return it to TADS by **October 12, 1979.** Even if you do not plan to attend the workshop, please fill out Part I and return it to TADS. A self-addressed stamped envelope has been provided. More detailed information on the workshop will be sent to those who request it later in the fall.

Thank you for your help in planning this workshop.

Planning Committee Members:
Louise Phillips, Magnolia, Arkansas
Patricia Hutinger, Macomb, Illinois
Corinne Garland, Williamsburg, Virginia
Steve Threet, Columbia, Tennessee
Harris Gabel, Nashville, Tennessee

RURAL WORKSHOP SURVEY

Project Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

_____

_____

Phone: _____

Name and Title of person(s) completing this questionnaire: _____

_____

Please complete the following questions:

PART I

1. Do you consider your project to be a "rural" project? _____ yes _____ no

   Why? _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. Do you now or do you intend to work with projects, agencies, or families in rural areas?

   _____ yes _____ no

3. Do you and/or other members of your staff plan to attend the rural workshop?

   _____ yes _____ no _____ maybe

   If yes, how many? _____

If you do not plan to attend the workshop, you need not complete Parts II and III. Please return in the envelope provided. Thank you.

RURAL WORKSHOP INTEREST SURVEY

PART II (Complete only if interested in attending the workshop):

Following is a list of potential topics for workshops, small group discussion, and presentations identified by the Rural Workshop Planning Committee. Please indicate your level of interest in each topic by circling the appropriate number.

Suggested Topics	Level of Interest				
	High		Moderate		Low
1. Transportation problems	5	4	3	2	1
2. Securing funding for rural programs	5	4	3	2	1
3. Interagency cooperation	5	4	3	2	1
4. Reaching geographically isolated clients	5	4	3	2	1
5. Recruiting staff for rural areas	5	4	3	2	1
6. Establishing rapport/trust with rural clients	5	4	3	2	1
7. Influencing decision-makers	5	4	3	2	1
8. Rural child find	5	4	3	2	1
9. Recruiting support services staff, e.g., OT, PT, Speech	5	4	3	2	1
10. Stresses on service providers, i.e., understaffing, travel, home visitor burn-out	5	4	3	2	1
11. Working with public schools	5	4	3	2	1
12. Cost effective delivery strategies	5	4	3	2	1
13. Working with the extended family	5	4	3	2	1
14. Establishing community communication and awareness	5	4	3	2	1
15. Serving rural minorities and cultural groups, e.g., migrants	5	4	3	2	1
16. Obtaining diagnostic workups	5	4	3	2	1
17. Easing home/based to center/based transitions	5	4	3	2	1
18. Training personnel to work in rural areas	5	4	3	2	1
19. Getting your rural experience into print	5	4	3	2	1
20. Transition from project to public schools/agencies	5	4	3	2	1
21. Using university resources	5	4	3	2	1
22. Getting parent involvement	5	4	3	2	1
23. Working in rural cultures	5	4	3	2	1
24. Working with rural politics	5	4	3	2	1
25. What other fields have learned	5	4	3	2	1

RURAL WORKSHOP INTEREST SURVEY

PART III (Complete only if interested in attending the workshop).

1. Can you list other topics in addition to those listed in Part II above?

   Please list: _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. What do you think are the three most critical issues faced by rural service providers?

   1. _____

      _____

   2. _____

      _____

   3. _____

      _____

3. What do you think are three most critical issues faced by families of handicapped children in rural areas?

   1. _____

      _____

   2. _____

      _____

   3. _____

      _____

4. What are some unique strengths of rural communities in serving young handicapped children and their families?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. Which topic areas in Part II do you consider to be strengths in your project?

   Please list by topic number.

	Other Strengths:
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

6. Would you be willing to contribute to the workshop program in one of your strength areas?

   _____ yes _____ no

   If yes, which area(s):

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

7. Can you recommend any other resources (persons, publications, programs) that might be useful in planning and conducting the workshop?

Name and Address of Resource	Topic Area
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Appendix B

Rural Workshop Agenda

HCEEP Rural Workshop

Maxwell House Hotel
Nashville, Tennessee

March 12-14, 1980

AGENDA

Wednesday, March 12th

1:30 - 4:30 Rural Consortium Task Force Meetings

6:30 - 8:30 Registration

8:00 - 9:30 Opening Session
- Welcome - Tal Black
- HCEEP Rural Consortium - Harris Gabel
- BEH Presentation - Sandra Hazen
- Keynote - *Special Education: The Broader Context of National Rural Policy* - Dr. Jerry Fletcher

9:30 - 10:30 Social

Thursday, March 13th

8:00 - 9:00 Coffee and Danish

9:00 - 9:45 General Session
- Workshop Overview and Announcements - Joyce Jackson
- Presentation of HCEEP Rural Projects Survey - Tal Black

9:45 - 10:15 Break

10:15 - 11:45 Concurrent Sessions
- *a. Securing Funding for Rural Programs - Art Moreau, Barbara Smith, Judi Wallace, Chairperson: Tal Black
- b. Assessing Parent Needs and Planning Intervention Programs - Vicki Dean, Judy Adams, Chairperson: Joyce Jackson
- c. Influencing Decision Makers - Louise Phillips, Floyd Dennis, Lillie Bogan, Chairperson: Mike Woodard
- *d. Interagency Coordination: Best Practices - Harris Gabel, Jim Fitch, Steve Guedet, Chairperson: Bill Woodrich

12:00 - 1:30 Luncheon Session
- Announcements and Introductions - Mike Woodard
- Rural Consortium Update - Harris Gabel, Louise Phillips, Patricia Hutinger, Dale Gentry
- Dialogue with Jerry Fletcher

1:30 - 3:00 Concurrent Sessions
- a. What Other Fields Have Learned - Jon Peters, JoyLean Sampson, Richard Couto, Dorsey Walker, Chairperson: Harris Gabel
- *b. Recruiting Staff for Rural Areas - Glendon Casto, Sandra Hazen, Taylor Cook, Dick Clevelend, Chairperson: Steve Threet
- c. Cost Effective Delivery Strategies - Tom Clark, Dale Gentry, Neil Schortinghuis, Chairperson: Tal Black
- *d. Evaluation of Parent Training and Education Programs in Rural Areas - Bill Hoehle, Chairperson: Joyce Jackson

3:00 - 3:30 Break

3:30 - 5:00 Concurrent Sessions
- *a. Rural Child Find: A Poster Party - Judy Adams, Barbara Hanners, Corrine Garland, Vicki Wozniak, Tom Miller, Chairpersons: Pennie Anderson and Mary Strode
- b. Interagency Trouble Shooting - Rena Wheeler, Bill Hoehle, Christine Bartlett, Chairperson: Patricia Hutinger
- c. Establishing Community Communication and Awareness - David Kutz, Bill Sadka, Chairperson: David Gilderman
- d. Cost Effective Delivery Strategies (see Thursday 1:30 - 3:00)

* Session is only offered one time

Friday, March 14th

8:00 - 9:00	Coffee and Danish
9:00 - 10:15	Concurrent Sessions *a. Stress on Rural Service Providers - Donald Perras, Chairperson: Tal Black b. Assessing Parent Needs and Planning Intervention Programs - (see Thursday 10:15 - 11:45) c. What Other Fields Have Learned - (see Thursday 1:30 - 3:00) d. Cost-Effective Delivery Strategies - (see Thursday 1:30 - 3:00)
10:15 - 10:45	Break
10:45 - 12:00	Concurrent Sessions *a. Transportation Problems - Jim Groen, Chairperson: Mike Woodard *b. Successful Practices in Securing Funding - Corrine Garland, Jane Weil, Chairperson: Tal Black c. Establishing Community Communication and Awareness - (see Thursday 3:30 - 5:00) d. Influencing Decision Makers - (see Thursday 10:15 - 11:45)
12:15 - 1:30	Luncheon Session Workshop Evaluation and Closing Closing Speaker - The Honorable Wes Watkins
1:30 - 4:30	Rural Consortium Task Force Meeting

Appendix C

List of Rural Workshop Participants

Sheila Spivey
Area of Special Education
PO Box 2592
University, AL 25486

Marion Smith
Project REACT
Tuscaloosa, AL 35402

Marge Ford
1020 I Strat
Anchorage, Alaska 49502

Don F. Perras
1635 Central Avenue
Bridgeport, Conn.

Lillie Bogan
Beth Eckels
C-F-C Project
Ochlocknee, GA 31773

Dale Gentry
Department of Special Education
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho 83843

Pennie Anderson
Mary Strode
Bill Woodrich
Macomb 0-3
Macomb, IL 61455

Stephen Guedet
Project RHISE/Outreach
650 N. Main Street
Rockford, IL 61103

Pat Hutinger
27 Horrabin Hall
Western Illinois University
Macomb, IL 61455

Willia Dean Propst
Project LEEP
JAMP Dianostic Center
Route 1
Karnak, IL 62956

Gen Shelton
Developmental Training Center
2853 East Tenth Street
Bloomington, IN 47401

Carol Leland
Karin Rumold
Children's Services
Box 451
Colby, KS 67701

Vickie Cochrane
Baptist Day Care
Box 104
El Dorado, KS 67042

Janelle Mulvenon
3023 Canterbury
Salina, KS 67401

Sarah Osborn
Punkin' Patch
1602 Glenellen
Garden City, KS 67846

Judy C. Adams
Jerri Millican
Bob Kibler
PEEEC
Murray State University
Murray, KY 42071

Dianne Flynn
Diane Murphy
Nancy Severns
PEEEC
Fredonia Elementary, Box 177
Fredonia, KY 42411

Gina Palmer
Jo Allard
UCPB Child Development Center
465 Springhill Drive
Lexington, KY 40503

James Fitch
Brescia College Hearing Impaired Project
Owensboro, KY 42301

Christine B. Bartlett
Department of Education
Augusta, ME 04333

Raymond Bryant
211 Oakley Street
Cambridge, MD 21613

Ann Usiondik
212 Maryland Avenue
Cambridge, MD 21613

Vicki Wozniak
Tom Miller
Telstar
1691 M32 West
Alpena, MI 49707

William J. Sadka
1015 - 25th Avenue
Meridian, MS 39301

Barbara Hanners
Project RURAL
MVW Speech & Hearing Center
PO Box W-1340
Columbus, MS 39701

Genora Halloway
Lisa Romine
Project RUN/Outreach
PO Box 967
Oxford, MS 38611

Diana J. Patten
722 S. Jefferson
Springfield, MO 65801

Rena Wheeler
Project Sunrise
Eastern Montana College
Billings, MT 59101

Kathy Koop
Nebraska Childfind
2507 South Canterbury
Lincoln, NE 68512

Sharon Palmer
Nevada Dept. of Education
State Mail Room
Las Vegas, NV 89158

Mary Morse
Infant Model Project
Concord, NH 03301

Ramona E. Patterson
Humiston Building
Northern Lakes Region Special Services
Meredith, NH 03253

Richard J. Minoque
Tecler Diagnostic Center
11 Liberty Street
Amsterdam, NY 12010

Maureen Sullivan
St. Lawrence BOCES
Outer State
Canton, NY 13617

Ralph Conn
"I Can/Will Do It" Project
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608

Constance E. Holt
Access to Mainstream
Route 1, Box 335
Colerain, NC 27924

William F. Hoehle
Children's Services
Southeast Mental Health and Retardation Center
108 8th Street South
Fargo, ND 58103

Rebecca Zuleski
Vinton County Schools
Vinton County Early Intervention Project
McArthur, OH 45651

Ruth Schennum
Early Childhood Center
Chepachet School
Glocester, RI 02814

Jackie Seat
Vivian Correa
Marsha Heiman
Elizabeth Gerloc
Judy Davis
Mary Porter
Maria Donoforo
Cecilia Andrews
Vaughan Stagg
Rick Lane
Harris Gabel
FIT Project
Peabody College
PO Box 151
Nashville, TN 37203

Brenda Peden
Jan Bothwell
Pam Frakes
Carole Nettles
Steve Threet
Susan Woodfin
The Early Lifestyle Project
King's Daughters' School
412 West 9th Street
Columbia, TN 38401

Paula Goodroe
Benita Collins
Box 66
Peabody College
Nashville, TN 37203

Kathy Joyner
732 North Main
Child Development Center
Shelbyville, TN 37160

Mary Jane Adams
Route 1
Lewisburg, TN 37091

Ann Hatley
Marshall County Board of Education
Route 1
Lewisburg, TN 37091

Cyndi Murrell
Hampshire Pike
Forrest Acres
Columbia, TN 38401

Tom Ford
Route 2, Osborn Lane
Watertown, TN

Leanne Tatum
PO Box 1084
Columbia, TN 38401

Pamela Doxsey
3704 Richland Avenue
Nashville, TN 37205

Ruthelma Warf
102 Poplar
Dickson, TN

Ida Sue Westerman
Dickson County Board of Education
Charlotte, TN

Beverly D. Taylor
231 Riverwood Drive
Hendersonville, TN 37075

Sumner County
Pupil Services Dept.
Box 1148
Gallatin, TN 37066

Bettye J. Berry
TN State Dept. of Education
Nashville, TN 37211

Janet Coscarelli
Jo Von Nieda
1101 - 17th Ave., South
Nashville, TN 37212

Barbara Devaney
Barbara Fiechtl
Linnea Harrison
Matthew A. Timm
Regional Intervention Program
2400 White Avenue
Nashville, TN 37204

Jennifer Moulder
Community Services Office
Clover Bottom Developmental Center
Donelson, TN 37214

Vicki S. Dean
Frank Skinnel
Joyce B. Weiler
Box 279
Clinch Powell Ed. Coop.
Tazewell, TN 37879

Jimmye L. Gowling
845 Parsons Drive
Beaumont, TX 77706

Mary McGongel
Project Transition
2501 Dunstan
Houston, TX 77005

Jamie Tucker
Box 4170
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX 79409

Glen Casto
Debra Tolfa
Exceptional Child Center
UMC 68
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84321

Tom Clark
Dept. of Communication Disorders
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322

Corinne Garland
CDR
PO Box 299
Lightfoot, VA 23090

Marie Gaasholt
PDAS Suite 225, U. District Bldg.
1107 NE 45th
Seattle, WA 98105

Steve Myers
Box 874
Spokane, WA 99210

Patricia McMillan
Route 1, Box 36
Union, WV 24983

Nancy Punkore
General Delivery
Brooks, WV 25957

Henry Lynn
Barbara Lynn
PO Box 330
Union, WV 24983

Neal Schortinghuis
412 Slifer
Portage, WI 53901

Sue Treb
CeSa #6
725 W. Park Avenue
Chippiwa Falls, WI 54729

Awilda Torres
Department of Education
Program of Special Education
Hato Rey, PR 00919

II. Other Resources

Dick Cleveland
General Electric Company
Industrial Park
Columbia, TN 38401

Taylor Cook
Hospital Affiliates Internation
Lewisburg Community Hospital
Lewisburg, TN 37091

Richard Couto
Center for Health Services
Vanderbilt University
Station 17
Nashville, TN 37232

Floyd Dennis
1502 17th Avenue, South
Nashville, TN 37212

Jerry Fletcher
1212 Mariner Way
Apartment 2
Tiburon, CA 94920

Jim Groen
Michigan Department of Social Services
Medical Services Administration
300 South Capital
Lansing, MI 48926

P. David Kurtz
University of Tennessee
Box 90440
Nashville, TN 37209

Art Moreau
Box 52
Peoria, IL 61650

J n Peters
School for Continuing Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN

Louise Phillips
PO Box 428
Magnolia, AR 71753

JoyLean Sampson
Human Service Research Unit
Department of Social Welfare
Tennessee State University
3500 Centennial Blvd.
Nashville, TN 37203

Barbara Smith
CEC
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091

Dorsey Walker
PO Box 97
Section, AL 35771

Judi Wallace
1771 T Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

The Honorable Wes Watkins
424 Cannon House Building
Washington, DC 20515

Jane Weil
Box 22
Stueben, ME 04680

III. TADS/WESTAR Staff

Tal Black
Mike Woodard
TADS
500 NCNB Plaza
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Joyce Jackson
David Gilderman
WESTAR
1107 NE, 45th Street
Suite 215
Seattle, WA 98105

IV. BEH

Sandra Hazen
Office of Special Education
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
6th and D Street
Donohoe Building, Room 3120
Washington, DC 20202

Appendix D

List of Congressional Rural Caucus

As of 3/04/80

Congressional Rural Caucus

"Members of Congress Working for Rural America"

U.S. House of Representatives • 309 House Office Building, Annex # 1 • Washington, D.C. 20515 • 202/225-5080

Executive Committee

Wes Watkins (D-Ok.) Chairman
Bill Alexander (D-Ark.)
Gunn McKay (D-Utah)

James T. Broyhill (R-N.C.) Vice-Chairman
Les AuCoin (D-Ore.)
John Paul Hammerschmidt (R-Ark.)
Frank G. Tsatras – Director

Ed Jones (D-Tenn.) Vice-Chairman
Gillis Long (D-La.)
Richard Nolan (D-Minn.)

(1)

SUBJECT: CONGRESSIONAL RURAL CAUCUS MEMBERSHIP

Name	Telephone	Room No.
Abdnor, James (SD)	55165	1224
Albosta, Donald Joseph (MI)	53561	1318
Alexander, Bill (AK)	54076	2201
Andrews, Ike (NC)	51784	2446
Andrews, Mark (ND)	52611	2186
Anthony, Beryl, Jr. (AK)	53772	506
Aspin, Les (WI)	53031	442
AuCoin, Les (OR)	50855	231
Baldus, Alvin (WI)	55506	1424
Bedell, Berkley (IA)	55476	405
Bereuter, Douglas K. (NE)	54806	1314
Bethune, Ed (AK)	52506	1330
Bevill, Tom (AL)	54876	2305
Bolling, Richard (MO)	54535	2365
Bowen, David R. (MI)	55876	2421
Breaux, John B. (LA)	52031	2159
Brown, Geroge E., Jr. (CA)	56161	2342
Broyhill, James T. (NC)	52576	2340
Burton, John L. (CA)	55161	1714
Burton, Phillip (CA)	54965	2304
Byron, Beverly B. (MD)	52721	1216
Campbell, Carroll A., Jr. (SC)	56030	1723
Carter, Tim Lee (KY)	54601	2267
Chappell, Bill, Jr. (FL)	54035	2353
Clausen, Don H. (CA)	53311	2336
Clinger, William F., Jr. (PA)	55121	1221
Coelho, Tony (CA)	56131	216
Coleman, E. Thomas (MO)	57041	1527
Daniel, Dan (VA)	54711	1705
Davis, Mendel, J. (SC)	53176	2161
Derrick, Butler (SC)	55301	133
Eckhardt, Bob (TX)	54901	1741
English, Glenn (OK)	55565	109
Erdahl, Arlen (MI)	52271	1017
Fazio, Vic (CA)	55716	1709
Fithian, Floyd J. (IN)	55777	129
Flippo, Ronnie G. (AL)	54801	439
Foley, Thomas S. (WA)	52006	1201
Fountain, L. H. (NC)	54531	2188
Ginn, Bo (GA)	55831	317
Gore, Albert Jr. (TN)	54231	1417
Grassley, Charles E. (IA)	53301	1227

Name	Telephone	Room No.
Gudger, Lamar (NC)	56401	428
Hagedorn, Tom (MN)	52472	440
Hamilton, Lee H. (IN)	55315	2470
Hammerschmidt, John Paul(AK)	54301	2160
Hance, Kent (TX)	54005	1039
Hanley, James (NY)	53701	239
Harkin, Tom (IA)	53806	403
Hightower, Jack (TX)	53706	120
Holland, Ken (SC)	55501	103
Hopkins, Larry J. (KY)	54706	514
Hubbard, Carroll, Jr. (KY)	53115	204
Huckaby, Jerry (LA)	52376	228
Hutto, Earl (FL)	54136	508
Ichord, Richard H. (MO)	55155	2302
Jeffords, James M. (VT)	54115	1510
Jenkins, Ed (GA)	55211	217
Jenrette, John W., Jr. (SC)	53315	240
Jones, Ed (TN)	54714	104
Jones, James R. (OK)	52211	203
Kildee, Dale E. (MI)	53611	314
Kogovsek, Ray (CO)	54761	501
Leach, Claude (Buddy) (LA)	52777	1229
Long, Gillis W. (LA)	54926	2445
Lott, Trent (MS)	55772	2400
Lundine, Stanley N. (NY)	53161	430
McCormack, Mike (WA)	55816	2352
McHugh, Matthew, F. (NY)	56335	336
McKay, Gunn (UT)	50453	2209
Murphy, John M. (NY)	53371	2187
Neal, Stephen L. (NC)	52071	331
Nichols, Bill (AL)	53261	2417
Nolan, Richard (MN)	52331	214
Oberstar, James J. (MN)	56211	323
Obev, David R. (WI)	53365	2230
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr. (MA)	55111	2231
Panetta, Leon E. (CA)	52861	431
Preyer, Richardson (NC)	53065	2344
Price, Melvin (IL)	55661	2110
Rahall, Nick Joe, II (WVA)	53452	408
Richmond, Frederick W. (NY)	55936	1707
Rose, Charles (NC)	52731	2435
Roth, Toby (WI)	55665	1008
Runnels, Harold (NM)	52365	1535
Santini, Jim (NV)	55965	1007
Schroeder, Patricia (CO)	54431	2437
Sharp, Philip R. (IN)	53021	1421
Shelby, Richard C. (AL)	52665	1408
Shumway, Norman D. (CA)	52511	1228
Shuster, Bud (PA)	52431	2455
Simon, Paul (IL)	55201	227
Skelton, Ike (MO)	52876	1404
Smith, Neal (Iowa)	54426	2373
Steed, Tom (OK)	56165	2405
Stenholm, Charles W. (TX)	56605	1610
Stump, Bob (AZ)	54576	211
Synar, Michael Lynn (OK)	52701	1338
Tauke, Thomas J. (IA)	52911	319
Traxler, Bob (MI)	52806	2448

Name	Tele-phone	Room No.
Ullman, Al (OR)	55711	1136
Watkins, Wes (OK)	54565	424
Weaver, James (OR)	56416	1226
White, Richard C. (TX)	54831	2266
Whitten, Jamie L. (MS)	54306	2314
Williams, Pat (MT)	53211	1233
Wilson, Charles (TX)	52401	1214
Won Pat, Antonio Borja (Guam)	51188	2441
Young, Don (AK)	55765	1210

Appendix E

HCEEP Rural Resource Directory

HCEEP RURAL RESOURCE DIRECTORY

Compiled by Judi Wallace

HCEEP RURAL RESOURCE DIRECTORY

This directory is composed of a list of national organizations, individuals, and representatives of agencies concerned with rural development and revitalization.

The purpose of this directory is to provide a reference to individuals and organizations with rural interests sensitive to the needs of early childhood special education. This directory is by no means complete; there are additional persons and organizations concerned with rural issues that are not included.

Organizations

°Academy for Contemporary Problems
1501 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201
614-421-7700

Rural focus: The academy carries out research and policy studies in order to identify economic and social changes in the nation and their potential impacts on the various regions, states, and communities; and to develop alternative approaches.
Publications: Public Services in Rural Areas (1973);
Ruralism and Realism (1974)

°Center for Community Change
1000 Wisconsin Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20007
202-338-6310

Rural focus: The center's projects include research on rural education, technical assistance, intervention, and public information activities.

°Center for Rural Studies
1499 Potrero
San Francisco, California
415-648-2094

Rural Focus: This public interest research group delves into all aspects of rural life.

°Congressional Rural Caucus
Frank Tsutras, Director
309 House Annex Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
202-225-5080
Chairman, Wes Watkins, Oklahoma

Rural focus: This bi-partisan group of U.S. Representatives is dedicated to the orderly growth and development of Rural America. Priorities center on issues of education, health, public works, agriculture, and so forth.

°ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education (ERIC-CRESS)
Box 3AP, New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003
Everett Edington, Director
505-646-2623

Rural focus: Education

Funded by the National Institute of Education, (ERIC-CRESS) provides ready access to exemplary programs, research, and development efforts and information related to education in small schools and rural areas.

°National Area Development Institute
P.O. Box 967
Rockport, Texas 78382
512-729-6878

Rural focus: The institute publishes a newsletter which focuses on legislation, programs, and recent publications of interest to rural development practitioners.
Publication: Financing Rural Development

°National Association of Counties
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
202-785-9577

Rural focus: The association adopted a Fair Share Program for Rural Counties with positions in rural development, education, health, welfare, and social services.
Publication: County News

°National Conference of State Legislatures
444 N. Capitol Street
Washington, D.C. 20001

Rural focus: The Committee on Rural Development presents rural issues, including those which deal with the full implementation of Rural Development Act of 1972.

°National Governors Association
Jackie Usellis - Education Liaison
444 N. Capitol Street
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-5300

Rural focus: The Committee on Community and Economic Development is primarily responsible for rural affairs.

°National Rural Center (NRC)
1828 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-331-0258

Rural focus: All aspects of rural development and revitalization are covered, including education, health, and community economic development. The NRC was created to develop policy alternatives to provide information which can help rural people achieve full potential.

°Rural America
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-659-2800

Rural focus: This non-profit membership organization was established to meet the need for continuing national advocacy on behalf of rural people.
Publications: Rural America; Rural Community Development Newsletter

°Rural/Regional Education Association
Director, Lewis Tamblyn
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Rural focus: The association serves as an advocate organization to develop appropriate educational programs for rural/regional use.

°The Rural Coalition
Barbara Rose, Executive Director
1828 L Street, N.W., Rm. 902
Washington, D.C. 20036

Rural focus: This coalition of 50 local, state, and national organizations is aimed at influencing public policies and processes to benefit disadvantaged rural communities.

Additional Resource Advocates

°American Association of School Administrators
Walter Turner
1801 N. Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209
703-528-0700

°Association for Childhood Education International
3615 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016
202-363-6963

°Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
225 N. Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
703-549-9110

°Center for Rural Education of Small Schools
College of Education
Kansas State University
2921 Arbor Drive
Manhattan, Kansas 66502
913-539-0555

°National Association of State Boards of Education
444 N. Capitol Street
526 Hall of the States
Washington, D.C. 20001

°National Center for Research in Vocational Education
Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

°National Rural Project
Center for Innovation and Development
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky 42071

°National School Board Association
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
202-337-7666
Director, James Mecklenburger

°People United for Rural Education
Rural Route
Latimer, Iowa 50452

°Rural Development Center
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri 65201

°Rural Education Project
Education Commission of the States
300 Lincoln Tower
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80295

Resource Persons

°Frank Fratoe
Sociologist
Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

°Norman E. Hearn
Special Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

°Stuart Rosenfeld
Senior Associate
Program on Educational Policy and Organization
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C.

°Peggy Ross
Research Analyst and Sociologist
Economics, Statistics and Cooperatives Services
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

°Tom Schultz, Co-chairman
Research Associate
Program on Educational Policy and Organization
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C.

°Jonathan Sher
OEDC-CERI
2 Rue Andre-Pascal
75775 Paris
CEDIX 16, France

°Jim Swiderski
House Agricultural Committee
1301 Longworth Building
Washington, D.C.
202-225-0418

Bibliographic Information

Cornman, J.M. & Madden, J.P. The Essential Process for a Successful Rural Strategy: A Policy Statement Following a National Evaluation of Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972. Washington, D.C.: The National Rural Center, 1977.

This 42 page report examines the potential of Title V as part of a broad national rural strategy.

Rural Community Development, Rural Public Transportation, and Rural Health Newsletter. Washington, D.C.: The National Rural Center.

These three newsletters contain reports of information gained in the course of the center's program activities. Rural Community Development addresses general community development in rural areas. Rural Public Transportation and Rural Health Newsletter are written for technical, specialized, rural practitioner audiences. The publications are mailed out four to six times annually and are free of charge.

Resource Guide for Rural Development: Handbook for Assessing Government and Private Funding Sources. (A National Rural Center Publication)

Sher, J. Revitalizing Rural Education: A Legislator's Handbook. National Conference of State Legislators, September, 1978.

Carter Administration. Small Community and Rural Development Policy Act. December 20, 1979.

Appendix F

Rural Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire

HCEEP RURAL WORKSHOP

Nashville, Tennessee
March 12-14, 1980

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to gather your opinions concerning the quality and usefulness of this workshop. We will use the information you provide to determine the effectiveness of this meeting and to improve future meetings of this kind. We appreciate your most honest and objective opinions. THANK YOU.

Please indicate your professional affiliation:

HCEEP Demonstration Project (East)	____	SIG	____
HCEEP Demonstration Project (West)	____	TA/BEH Staff	____
HCEEP Outreach Project (East)	____	Former HCEEP Project	____
HCEEP Outreach Project (West)	____	Other (please specify)	____

I. To what extent did you perceive the workshop to have achieved its purposes? (Please circle the appropriate response for each item.)

	Very Well			Adequately			Not at all
A. To identify issues and needs of rural projects.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
B. To facilitate communication and co-operation among rural HCEEP projects.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
C. To exchange information and ideas on best practices.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
D. To identify new developments and perspectives from other fields serving rural areas.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

II. The workshop agenda was structured so that participants could choose among several topics of high interest to rural HCEEP projects. Please rate sessions that you attended in terms of both quality and usefulness.

WEDNESDAY, March 12

	Quality							Usefulness						
Session Title	Excellent			Avg.		Poor		Very Useful			Of Some Use		Not Useful	
Keynote Address	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

THURSDAY, MARCH 13

Session Title	Quality: Excellent			Avg.		Poor		Usefulness: Very Useful			Of Some Use		Not Useful	
Securing funding for rural programs	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Assessing parent needs & planning intervention programs	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Influencing decision makers	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Interagency trouble shooting	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
What other fields have learned	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Recruiting staff for rural areas	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Cost effective delivery strategies/1:30 p.m.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Evaluation of parent training & education programs	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Rural child find: A poster party	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Interagency coordination: Best practices	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Establishing community communication & awareness	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Cost effective delivery strategies/3:30 p.m.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

FRIDAY, MARCH 14

Stress on rural service providers	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Assessing parent needs and planning intervention programs	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
What other fields have learned	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Cost effective delivery strategies	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Transportation problems	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Successful practices for securing funding	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Establishing community communication & awareness	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Influencing decision makers	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

We are very interested in your feedback. Please list any comments you wish to make on individual sessions. (Use back of form, if needed.)

Session Title:

Comments:

Session Title:

Comments:

III. Please respond to each of the following questions. Your answers will be carefully reviewed and considered.

1. What was the most positive part of the workshop for you? Please explain.

2. In future HCEEP rural consortium meetings and activities, what topics and issues do you believe should be addressed?

3. Do you feel this workshop was worth the time and effort you invested?
Yes ____ No ____

Comments:

4. Please indicate your overall satisfaction with this workshop. (Please circle appropriate response.)

Extremely Satisfied			Satisfied		Not at All Satisfied	
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

5. In your opinion, what was the weakest component (or aspect) of this workshop?

6. List any comments you would like to make concerning the workshop location, organization, time of meetings, accommodations, etc.

7. List any other comments.

Please return this questionnaire before you leave the workshop, or mail it to:

David Gilderman
WESTAR
University District Building, JD-06
1107 N.E. 45th, Suite 215
Seattle, WA 98105

TADS

500 NCNB Plaza

Chapel Hill, N.C.

27514

Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill